UC-NRLF
$B 467 439

BERKELEY
LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF
CALIFORNIA

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/oxforddivinesnot00browrich

THE

OXFORD DIVINES

NOT MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

BY

T. B. BROWNE,

OF MELLINGTON,

AUTHOR OF "THOUGHTS OF THE TIMES."

I persuade myself that I shall plainly shew, that the most vehement accusers are the greatest offenders, and that they are indeed, at this time, the greatest schismatics who make the way to heaven narrower, the yoke of Christ heavier, the differences of faith greater, the conditions of ecclesiastical communion harder and stricter, than they were made at the beginning by Christ and his apostles: they who talk of unity, but aim at tyranny, and will have peace with none but with their slaves and vassals.

CHILLINGWORTH.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR

LONGMAN, ORME, BROWN, GREEN, & LONGMANS,

PATERNOSTER-ROW.

1839.

ATHE
CANCE
LIBRARY.

LONDON:
Printed by A. SPOTTISWOODE,
New-Street-Square.

BX5203
.5
B7

THE

OXFORD DIVINES

NOT MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

CHAPTER I.

It would seem, on looking at the history of the Church of Christ in various ages, that real zeal for true religion has rarely with the multitude endured long. Energies, which might have done much if rightly directed, have not seldom been abused and wasted in disseminating errors which had little but their novelty to recommend them: often the austerity of one generation has provoked licentiousness in the next; and, at the present time, there is certainly some danger, lest the religious zeal, which, in this country, has hitherto favourably characterised the nineteenth century, should be diverted from its legitimate office of purifying the heart and mind,

056

into an exaggerated estimate of the importance of outward things, ordinances, forms, and ceremonies, ecclesiastical traditions, priestly authority and power.

There is nothing surprising in this. Men awakened to a sense of religion are naturally anxious to know their real state: the more obvious and scriptural mode of attaining this knowledge, by the examination of their own hearts, is at all times a hard task, in which, above all others, we are apt to deceive ourselves; for "the kingdom of God," says our Saviour, "cometh not with observation" (words surely not to be restricted merely to the first preaching of the Gospel, but descriptive also of the workings of divine grace in each individual Christian soul); and therefore it is that men cling in their perplexity to those visible and external symbols, according to Scripture and reason, typical only of the necessary distinction between the spiritual and carnal mind; but, according to their superstitious fears, aided by the artifices and half-assertions of ambitious priests, at length identified or inseparably united with, what, as signs only, they can but doubtfully and occasionally shadow out and declare.

A religion, then, which should promise boldly and undoubtingly, and impose on its followers many ordinances and observances to distinguish them from others, is little likely, from its peculiar apt-

itude to human weakness, to want adherents; and this is precisely the character of Popery, and the probable cause of its continued success, and of its recent revival amongst ourselves, at first sight so strangely at variance with the presumed spirit of inquiry, and the so-called philosophy of our times.

That Popery has decidedly increased among us, the number of Catholic chapels lately built and still building in all parts of the kingdom clearly proves; but a variety of it under a new and more insidious form, and therefore more dangerous, and difficult to combat, has raised its head in the Church of England itself, in the very bosom of that University of Oxford which has always advanced the loudest pretensions to superior orthodoxy.

It is proposed in the following pages to examine the peculiar doctrines of this sect, as developed in a work of one of its most distinguished advocates, viz. "Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church, viewed relatively to Romanism and popular Protestantism," by the Rev. J. H. Newman.* As the word "sect" will be objected to, I wish to premise that I do not use it with any intention to give offence, but because no outward division of

* The edition of Mr. Newman's book which I have used is the first; I am not aware that the second differs from it in any material point.

Christians can possibly be entitled to the exclusive, though many may to the joint use of its correlative, "church,"—certainly an ambiguous term, and probably the source of much error and presumption. Before, therefore, proceeding further, it will be advisable to endeavour to ascertain the meaning attached to the word church in Scripture and our own Articles, and afterwards, as far as possible, to use it throughout in no sense not warranted by their joint authority.

As this is the very question discussed by Hooker at the commencement of the third book of his Ecclesiastical Polity, it will be preferable, on every ground, to use, in stating it, the language of that great writer, whose opinions no Christian, of whatever denomination, will treat with disrespect.

"That Church of Christ which we properly term his body mystical, can be but one; neither can that one be sensibly discerned by any man, inasmuch as the parts thereof are some in heaven already with Christ, and the rest that are on earth (albeit their natural persons be visible), we do not discern under this property, whereby they are truly and infallibly of that body. Only our minds, by intellectual conceit, are able to apprehend that such a real body there is, a body collective, because it containeth a huge multitude; a body mystical, because the mystery of their conjunction is removed altogether

from sense. Whatsoever we read in Scripture concerning the endless love and the saving mercy which God showeth towards his Church, the only proper subject thereof is this church. Concerning this flock it is that our Lord and Saviour hath promised, 'I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of my hand.'* They who are of this society have such marks and notes of distinction from all others, as are not object unto our sense; only unto God, who seeth their hearts and understandeth all their secret cogitations; unto him they are clear and manifest. All men knew Nathanael to be an Israelite; but our Saviour, piercing deeper, giveth further testimony of him than men could have done with such certainty as he did, 'Behold an Israelite indeed in whom is no guile.'† If we profess, as Peter did‡, that we love the Lord, and profess it in the hearing of men, charity is prone to believe all things, and therefore charitable men are likely to think we do so, as long as they see no proof to the contrary. But that our love is sound and sincere; that it cometh from 'a pure heart, and a good conscience, and a faith unfeigned'§, who can pronounce, saving only the Searcher of all

* John, x. 28. † John, i. 47.
‡ John, xxi. 15. § 1 Tim. i. 5.

men's hearts, who alone intuitively doth know in this kind who are His?

"And as those everlasting promises of love, mercy, and blessedness, belong to the mystical Church, even so, on the other side, when we read of any duty which the Church of God is bound unto, the Church whom this doth concern is a sensibly known company. And this visible Church, in like sort, is but one, continued from the first beginning of the world to the last end. Which company being divided into two moieties, the one before, the other since the coming of Christ; that part, which since the coming of Christ, partly hath embraced, and partly shall hereafter embrace, the Christian religion, we term by a more proper name the Church of Christ. And therefore the apostle affirmeth plainly of all men Christian, that, be they Jews or Gentiles, bond or free, they are all incorporated into one company, they all make but *one body*. The unity of which visible body and Church of Christ consisteth in that uniformity which all several persons thereunto belonging have, by reason of that *one Lord*, whose servants they all profess themselves, that *one Faith*, which they all acknowledge, that *one Baptism*, wherewith they are all initiated.

"The visible Church of Jesus Christ is therefore one, in outward profession of those things which

supernaturally appertain to the very essence of Christianity, and are necessarily required in every particular Christian man."

The meaning attached to the word Church in Scripture sufficiently appears from this passage of Hooker, with which the nineteenth article of that portion of the visible Church, called the Church of England, precisely agrees: —

"The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly ministered, according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same."

The conclusion necessarily flowing from these premises, is thus honestly and fearlessly given by Hooker: —

"As for those virtues that belong unto moral righteousness and honesty of life, we do not mention them, because they are not proper unto Christian men as they are Christians, but do concern them as they are men. True it is, the want of these virtues excludeth from salvation: so doth much more the absence of inward belief of heart; so doth despair and lack of hope; so emptiness of Christian love and charity. But we speak now of the visible Church, whose children are signed with this mark, 'one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism.' In whomsoever

these things are, the Church doth acknowledge them for her children; them only she holdeth for aliens and strangers in whom these things are not found. For want of these it is that Saracens, Jews, and Infidels are excluded out of the bounds of the Church. Others we may not deny to be of the visible Church, as long as these things are not wanting in them. For apparent it is, that all men are of necessity either Christians or not Christians. If by external profession they be Christians, then are they of the visible Church of Christ; and Christians by external profession they are all, whose mark of recognisance hath in it those things which we have mentioned, yea, although they be impious idolaters, wicked heretics, persons excommunicable, yea, and cast out for notorious improbity. Such, withal, we deny not to be the imps and limbs of Satan, even as long as they continue such.

"Is it then possible, that the selfsame men should belong both to the synagogue of Satan and to the Church of Jesus Christ? Unto that Church which is his mystical body, not possible; because that body consisteth of none but only true Israelites, true sons of Abraham, true servants and saints of God. Howbeit of the visible body and Church of Jesus Christ, those may be, and oftentimes are, in respect of the main parts of their outward profession, who in regard of their inward disposition of mind, yea, of external

conversation, yea, even of some parts of their very profession, are most worthily both hateful in the sight of God himself, and in the eyes of the sounder part of the visible Church most execrable. Our Saviour therefore compareth the kingdom of Heaven to a net*, whereunto all which cometh neither is nor seemeth fish: his Church he compareth unto a field, where tares, manifestly known and seen by all men, do grow intermingled with good corn †, and even so shall continue till the final consummation of the world. God hath had ever, and ever shall have, some Church visible upon earth."

Hooker then proceeds to maintain, consistently with his argument, that even the idolatrous Jews did not cease to become members of the visible Church. It would appear, however, that there were two kinds of Jewish idolaters — the first consisting of those who served strange gods only, and wholly forsook the Lord; the second of those who combined the worship of the Lord with that of idols, like Jehu, who destroyed the worshippers of Baal, but departed not from serving "the golden calves that were in Bethel, and that were in Dan."‡ The first of these having abandoned even outward profession, can in no sense be considered members even of the visible Church; nor did Hooker, as I apprehend, so consider them: but the second must; otherwise Roman Ca-

* Matt. xiii. 47. † Ibid. 24. ‡ 2 Kings, x. 29.

tholics, as idolaters*, would be excluded from it; and the promise of our Lord, that the gates of hell should never prevail against his Church, would fail of effect, inasmuch as there was a period, and that not a brief one, when none can be proved wholly free from idolatry.

"For lack," says Hooker, "of diligent observing the difference, first, between the Church of God, mystical and visible, then between the visible, sound, and corrupted, sometimes more, sometimes less,—the oversights are neither few nor light that have been committed." One, not assuredly the least important, is that of Mr. Newman, when, as we have seen, contrary to Scripture, contrary to the Articles of that church which he professes, but, as will appear here-

* I am well aware that many will term this charge against the Romanists very illiberal; the question is, whether it is just. Few who have been at Rome can have avoided remarking the celebrated statue of St. Peter in the church of that name, and the numbers of all ranks who are constantly kneeling before it and kissing it. A portion of one of the feet of the statue is actually worn away by the impression of their lips. The worshippers of Baal, as we learn from what the seven thousand [a], who in those days belonged to the mystical Church, did not do, bowed the knee and kissed the idol, and therefore they are called idolaters: the Roman Catholics, at Rome itself, the very seat of their religion, and in its chiefest and most famous temple, do the same. It would be violating truth to give a different name to the same acts.

[a] 1 Kings, xix. 18.

after, to which he does not really belong; contrary to the authority of an Anglican divine, whose judgment has become proverbial,—he calls the Church of England, as contrasted with all Protestant churches or sects dissenting from it, "the One Holy Spouse of Christ, the Church Catholic, which in this country manifests herself in the Church, commonly so called, as her representative." p. 58.

It can scarcely be necessary to say more in refutation of this monstrous position, but some consequences flowing from it may be noticed. We ask, then,

Is it impossible for any dissenters to be members of the mystical Church? In other words, is it impossible for any dissenters to be saved? Bold as Mr. Newman is, he will hardly venture to answer in the affirmative. Yet this he must do, otherwise the Church of England is not the "One Spouse of Christ;" for dissenters, not being heathen, to become capable of salvation, must be members of the mystical Church; and if of the mystical, much more of the visible; and therefore their different sects, such of them, that is, as acknowledge "the same Lord, the same Faith, and the same Baptism," with ourselves, are equally with us "churches," or members of the one Church, and ought rightly to be so called.

But Mr. Newman, in this passage, makes no dis-

tinction between the mystical and visible Church. If he is speaking of the mystical, it will follow, from many passages of Scripture, that all members of the Church of England, even those who die unrepenting in the midst of their sins, must be saved, — a doctrine more impious and immoral than the wildest Antinomians ever taught : if he intends the visible Church only, he invites men to belong to it who are members already.

Again, Mr. Newman admits Roman Catholics to be members of the visible Church equally with the Church of England, although differing from it in very many and most material points. There are some dissenters who differ from the Church of England in no material point excepting episcopacy. They may use indeed a different liturgy, but this cannot be made the test of exclusion, for so also do the Roman Catholics. It follows, then, that the approving or disapproving of a particular form of church government becomes the solitary test, whereby we determine whether a man is a member of the visible Church of Christ or not. The test of "one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism," is excluded, and episcopacy substituted in its place. Is this Christianity or superstition ?

But Mr. Newman will deny that dissenters have the "same baptism" with the Church of England, and allege the doctrine of apostolical succession

in support of his denial. Superstition, however, will still be found the real foundation of his system ; a charge from which he has attempted in vain to defend himself, as it would seem, with a certain internal consciousness of its justice.

The doctrine of apostolical succession rests upon an assumed analogy between the Jewish and Christian priesthood, that, as Aaron and his descendants, with the whole tribe of Levi, were set apart for the ministry from the remainder of the Israelites, who were forbidden to exercise the priestly office, so in the Church of Christ, they who have received episcopal ordination, are also set apart to preach the Word and administer the sacraments, becoming thereby only successors of the apostles ; and that all who have received any other than episcopal ordination, presuming to exercise the priestly office, are guilty of the sin so signally punished in the cases of Korah and Uzziah.

Now, on turning to Scripture for confirmation of this supposed analogy, we find none. On the contrary, we find that preaching the Gospel, and administering the sacraments, are forbidden to women only,—an exception which implies, that if it had been intended that the prohibition should have extended farther, it would have been expressly mentioned, for "expressio unius est exclusio alterius ;" and no form of ordination is anywhere prescribed. It

would appear, indeed, that all who had received the Holy Ghost were at liberty to officiate as priests *, although not expressly appointed by the apostles: and with this supposition, the practice of lay baptism †, admitted to have always prevailed in the Church, strikingly agrees; for if laymen may baptize, assuredly they may also preach; since, with adult converts, baptism must be preceded by preaching.

Here, then, we have a decided failure in the supposed analogy between episcopacy and the Jewish priesthood; first, in that all Israelites not of the tribe of Levi were distinctly forbidden to enter the ministry, whereas even a form of ordination is not enjoined upon Christians; and secondly, in the practice of lay baptism, — a fact wholly irreconcileable with the supposed necessity of episcopal ordination, as an indispensable preliminary to the administration of the sacraments.

It will be conceded, however, that lay baptism is only justifiable in extreme cases; and that, though ordination is nowhere in Scripture expressly enjoined, still it is desirable on many grounds, and, according to the twenty-third article, imperative, that among all divisions of Christians a body of

* 1 Peter, ii. *5.*

† Bp. Tomline states lay baptism to have prevailed for several years in the Church of England. Theology, vol. ii. p. 474.

men should be set apart by some solemn religious ceremony for the service of God. The question is, whether it is not mere superstition to attach a peculiar sanctity to episcopal, above any other form of ordination. It might be answered at once, that Christianity is essentially a spiritual and not a formal religion; that the outward forms which it absolutely requires are two only, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, and those of the simplest kind. But the question is a formal one, and it will be better to treat it strictly as such. Episcopal ordination is supposed to be peculiarly sacred, because it is through the bishops of the Romish Church only that a priest of the present day can trace his spiritual descent from the apostles. Here the very point at issue, which is a fact, is assumed. There is not a priest in Christendom who can trace his spiritual descent unbroken to the apostles. There is not a priest in Christendom who can prove that there was no irregularity in the ordination of any one of his spiritual predecessors. And let it be remarked, that any irregularity in the baptism or ordination of any one bishop, (and who can doubt that in the dark ages there were many irregularities in the baptizing and ordaining of deacons, priests, and bishops,) would vitiate subsequent ordinations to an extent that cannot now be determined. Who will venture to affirm that none have ever been admitted into

the Church of England who had not received episcopal ordination? Was not the very establishment of the Church of England by Queen Elizabeth both irregular and violent? Besides, the theory of apostolical succession turning upon an outward form, it must be determined what inadvertencies, mistakes, or irregularities, are sufficient or insufficient to render that form of none effect, which can be done only by an infallible Church.

But this is not the only reason for esteeming the formal theory of apostolical succession a "vain deceit." In the Christian scheme, according to the true and primary sense of the words, there is not, and cannot be, either altar, priest, or sacrifice. The last priest was Christ; the last sacrifice was his death for the sins of men; and the last altar was the cross of Calvary. According to the view of Papists and Semi-Papists, there is no meaning in the most significant miracle of the crucifixion, the rending in twain of the veil of the temple. In the New Testament, mention is made of various offices in the Church of Christ: we read of apostles, prophets, evangelists, teachers, preachers, stewards, presbyters or elders, bishops or overseers, deacons or ministers; but of priests, as a select body, never. On the other hand, the words priests and priesthood are repeatedly applied to all true believers, as offering up to God not a formal or

outward, but a spiritual and inward sacrifice of their own souls and bodies. Rome, indeed, with her habitual superstitious presumption, has not only adopted from the Jewish dispensation, the words priest and altar; but to fill up the measure of her impiety, has invented a sacrifice. There are in the popish system two sacrifices: that of the mass, and that of the Eucharist, the consecrated wafer, or host, which means "the victim." To this cumbrous fabric of superstition, measured with "the line of confusion," and built up with "the stones of emptiness," we oppose the plain words of the Bible, "by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified." * It is obvious therefore, that the theory of a formal apostolical succession is needless, even if it could be proved, which, as we have seen, is impossible; inasmuch as such successors would have no office of absolute necessity to discharge. Priests, or rather ministers, as such, have no power; rites and ceremonies, as such, have no virtue. Faithful ministers of the Gospel are indeed among God's most efficient servants, but their value is determined by their fidelity. The holiest of all rites, the sacraments of Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord, are powerful means of grace, if we "rightly, worthily, and with faith receive them †;" if

* Hebrews, x. 14. See Art. xxxi.
† Art. xxviii.

we receive them otherwise, they serve only "to kindle God's wrath against us."

Do we then deny apostolical succession? No. We distinguish the formal from the real successors of the apostles: the formal, such as Judas Iscariot, called to be an apostle, by Christ himself, and yet a castaway, as if to shew that all outward forms are unavailing, though imposed by the holiest hands; and the real, who are to be found among all denominations of true Christians; ministers, who, however, or by whomsoever ordained, lead a holy and religious life, and preach the Gospel.

But the doctrine of apostolical succession maintained by the Oxford divines is not found in the articles of the Church of England; it is derived from the writings of priests in various ages, naturally desirous, by every means, to increase their own authority and importance, and from certain passages in the liturgy. Here, therefore, the question arises whether, if the liturgy in certain passages shall be found to add to or contradict the articles, the members of the Church of England are bound to adhere to the former or the latter; whether, in fact, the liturgy or the articles are the higher authority.

Taking the sixth article, that nothing is to be required of any man which cannot be proved from Scripture, as a key to all the rest, and therefore interpreting the articles to speak conditionally, not absolutely, they may be considered on the whole

consistent, and not contradictory to each other; but the same rule of interpretation cannot with propriety be applied to the liturgy. I should observe, that I use the term liturgy, in its widest sense, as embracing the whole ritual, forms of prayer and thanksgiving, adopted by the Church of England. In the ordination service then, we find the power of absolution or forgiveness of sins, asserted in the most express and positive manner to belong to every priest of the church:—"Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained." And yet, this high power thus directly claimed, without condition or qualification, in the very language of our Lord to his inspired apostles, is limited in exercise to a solitary instance in the visitation of the sick, and in that instance so studiously guarded by the rubric, that in fact it is, I believe, very rarely exercised. The absolution indeed at the commencement of the church-service claims the power, but has recourse to a solecism to avoid its exercise. We should expect to find it, if anywhere, in the communion service; it is not there; it is not in the articles; and it is scarcely necessary to observe, that we have no warrant whatever from Scripture for extending it beyond those inspired men, who wrought miracles to prove that they possessed it, or that its exercise

* Mark, xvi. 17.

would naturally lead, and has led in the Romish church, to the grossest superstition and the most enormous abuses.* What then is the inference, but that the general tenor of the liturgy, together with the articles, tacitly condemn (I say tacitly, because although the twenty-second article positively condemns the Romish doctrine of pardons, the thirty-sixth says the book of consecration contains in it nothing superstitious,) an unwarranted assumption of power, confined to two insulated passages, and in practice almost, if not altogether, dormant! Can then the liturgy be styled consistent with itself?

The liturgy also contradicts the articles, as in the prayer after baptism in the baptismal service.

"We yield thee most hearty thanks, most merciful Father, that it hath pleased thee to regenerate this infant with thy Holy Spirit, to receive him for

* No person at all acquainted with ecclesiastical history can doubt, that in very many instances, absolution has been improperly given, and improperly withheld; neither can it be otherwise, unless priests possess the power of discerning men's hearts. If it be said that such a power is communicated to them at their ordination by the Holy Spirit, it is an assertion which cannot be proved, and which facts contradict; besides, such an interposition of the Holy Spirit would be miraculous; and if priests have the power to work one miracle, there is no reason why they should not be able to work another. Let them work a miracle to prove that they can forgive sins, and, if we are satisfied that it is not a forgery, we will believe them; but not till then. In the mean time their interpretations of certain passages of Scripture would make Scripture contradict facts, and therefore must be wrong.

thine own child by adoption, and to incorporate him into thy Holy Church. And humbly we beseech thee to grant, that he being dead unto sin, and living unto righteousness, and being buried with Christ in his death, may crucify the old man, and utterly abolish the whole body of sin; and that as he is made partaker of the death of thy Son, he may also be partaker of his resurrection; so that finally with the residue of thy holy Church, he may be an inheritor of thine everlasting kingdom through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

The articles are far from confounding regeneration with baptism; thus in the twenty-fifth article it is said of sacraments, that "in such only as worthily receive the same, they have a wholesome effect or operation;" and in the twenty-seventh, of baptism, that it is "a sign of regeneration, or new birth, whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive baptism rightly are grafted into the Church." According to the first sentence of the prayer, all are regenerate by baptism, according to the articles they only who receive it worthily or rightly, which infants, being necessarily passive, cannot do. No infants afford any evidence at the time that they do so worthily receive it, and very many in their after lives most ample evidence to the contrary.

To confound regeneration with baptism, is also to confound the sign with the thing signified.

Again, the expression in the catechism, that the body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's supper," although limited to "the faithful," is hardly reconcileable with the words of the twenty-eighth article; "the body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner."

The superior authority claimed for the articles, not, indeed, as binding upon Christians unless supported by Scripture, but as declaratory of the doctrines of the Church of England, rests upon surer ground than the inconsistencies and contradictions of the liturgy. We must look to the respective origin of both. The liturgy is a ritual, derived chiefly from the Romanists, and necessarily therefore, in its original form tainted to a great degree with their superstitions and heresies. It is not surprising that in the revision which it underwent for the purpose of adapting it to the use of the Church of England, some weeds should have been left to disfigure, what may be termed, on the whole, a fair and fruitful garden, some errors should not have been rooted out. There is a wide distinction also between originating and adopting; a man may assent to an opinion already given, and yet if urged to declare himself, the discrepancies between what he had assented to and what he himself utters may

be found neither few nor trivial. The liturgy was for the most part adopted only by the Church of England, the articles were originated, if not wholly by Anglicans, at all events by their Protestant contemporaries. If then, in all cases where they shall be found to differ, we esteem the articles a higher authority than the liturgy, we follow, in endeavouring to ascertain the opinions of a collective body, the same reasonable and natural rule by which we are guided in ascertaining the opinions of an individual.

Again, the liturgy is spread over a wide surface, the articles are confined within a comparatively brief space, and the probability of errors increases with the multiplication of words. The language also of a rule of faith, such as the articles, is and ought to be most studiously guarded; in prayer remissness is indeed inexcusable: yet the same scrupulous balancing of every word and sentence is hardly to be expected. On this subject much more might be said, but, perhaps, it will be sufficient to add, that unqualified adhesion to the articles being required as an indispensable requisite from every man on his ordination as a minister of the Church of England, can it be honest in any outwardly to continue members of a communion whose doctrines they denounce, after pledging themselves inviolably to maintain them by their own most solemn act?

We now proceed to the examination of Mr. New-

man's book. He begins, pp. 1, 2., somewhat suspiciously, with a condemnation of inquiry, which has been so repeatedly and amply defended that it can hardly be necessary to discuss it now. Some inquiry surely must, in every case, precede belief, or there can be no security that we shall believe what is true. Assent without inquiry usually springs from indifference to truth; men do not inquire because they feel no interest in the subject: whereas, on the other hand, there can hardly be inquiry which deserves the name, without some desire to know the truth. The Bible expressly enjoins inquiry; thus we are told to "search the Scriptures," and to "be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you with meekness and fear"!* It will, perhaps, be found that inquiry is commonly discouraged only by those who have reason to dread it. Mr. Newman, it appears, would have inquiry silenced by force: pp. 5, 6. his complaint of being "reduced to the use of argument," reminds us of Cruelty in the Old Morality,

> "If I might do what I list,
> Not one of them all that should 'scape my fist."

Mr. Newman goes on to make many assertions, as that "it is certain, from history, that the meaning of the word Church was undisputed" (p. 4.); that the

* 1 Peter, iii. 15.

liberty of private judgment is "a liberty to the sword, to the pestilence, and to the famine;" thus giving an entirely new interpretation to the prophet Jeremiah, xxxiv. 17.; (p. 5.); that "Ignatius and Polycarp enjoyed a primitive truth which the nineteenth century has lost" (p. 9.). As Mr. Newman produces no proof whatever in this place in support of any of these assertions, it is not necessary for the present to reply to them; but no one can fail to remark how easy it is to make them.

At p. 13. Mr. Newman speaks of "our divinely framed system," leaving it in doubt whether he means Christianity, which, indeed, is not a system at all; or the Church of England, which is not a system either, and which can only be termed "divinely framed," as one of the many visible members of Christ's body, and not exclusively; or the peculiar sect to which he himself belongs. It may seem trivial, but on consideration it will be found not so, to remark, that here and elsewhere Mr. Newman calls the Church of England "the Church," implying that its claims to be styled the Church of Christ are superior to those of any other church, — an arrogant assumption, wholly unsupported by our articles, and which cannot be justified without infallibility.

We are enabled to appreciate the value of Mr. Newman's historical assertions when we find him,

at pages 14. and 16., styling Charles I. and Archbishop Laud "martyrs," the first being most clearly proved to have been faithless, and the second cruel; and he seems to consider that the conduct of Laud may have been "most judicious and successful in a religious point of view," but most unfavourable to "the temporal aggrandisement of the Church." Mr. Newman must not be permitted thus to misstate the charge against Laud. Cutting off men's ears cannot be termed a "religious" act. When St. Peter cut off the ear of Malchus, our Lord did not commend, but rebuke him; "Put up again thy sword into his place: for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword."* If St. Peter was wrong, Laud could not have been right. Neither can he, with any propriety, be called "a martyr;" for, though we are far from justifying his execution, he met with the death which all persecutors provoke.

At page 20. Mr. Newman admits that his system, which he calls *Via Media*, "has never existed except on paper;" it is plain, therefore, on his own shewing, that it is not the doctrine of the Church of England. It cannot be the doctrine of those who are called High-churchmen, for that has had always a real existence; still less is it that of the Latitudinarians, or of the Calvinists, and, if none of these, it

* Matt. xxvi. 52.

will not be easy for its supporters to prove that it is not a novelty, to a greater or less extent.

From p. 27. to the end of his introduction, Mr. Newman assumes that revealed religion is "a positive system," and this mistaken assumption is probably one of the chief sources of his errors. We are not called upon to prove a negative; it is Mr. Newman's duty to show that revelation is a system, which he has not done: on the contrary, he admits afterwards, at p. 109., that "little has actually been revealed to us in a systematic way." Can he shew that any thing has? If the Bible were a system, or religion a science, how could either be adapted, as they are, to all classes of minds? Superior attainments in a science necessarily require superior intellects; but in scriptural knowledge, in an insight into the true meaning of the word of God, how often do we see that "God hath chosen the foolish things of the world, to confound the wise"!* "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned."† But to prostrate our reason, as Mr. Newman requires, before traditions or systems of men, is to neglect the talent which God has committed to us; and, moreover, an act of irreverence and impiety towards his revealed word; it is to treat it as insufficient and

* 1 Cor. i. 27. † 1 Cor. ii. 14.

imperfect, and to raise things human to an equality with things divine. Thus, to say that "no member of the English church allows himself to build on any other doctrine than that found in our book of Common Prayer," (p. 28.), is to raise the Prayer-book — inconsistent and contradictory as in some respects it is — to a level, or rather to more than a level, with the Bible; nor is there less impiety, nor, as we shall see, less absurdity, in accepting "all greater matters of theology," because "the witness of our great masters in their behalf is prominent and concordant," rather than from the only fountain of all truth.

"The Bible," says Mr. Newman, (p. 34.) "is a small book; any one may possess it; and every one, unless he be very humble, will think he is able to understand it." There is a looseness of expression here, which whether designed or not, must not pass unnoticed. The question is, whether every man may not understand enough of the Bible to make him "wise unto salvation," not whether any man may understand the whole Bible, which, as far as I know, no one man has ever yet pretended to do. Will Mr. Newman venture to say, that any man who is a responsible agent and therefore of sound mind, is incapable of understanding enough of the Bible to make him "wise unto salvation"? If so, why was "the Gospel preached to the poor"?

If they could not understand it, it was a mere mockery. The fact that the poor and ignorant not less, but more frequently than the rich and learned, were preached to by the inspired apostles, necessarily implies that they were capable of understanding the Gospel. The Scripture is express: "No man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost;" there is no exception in favour of the rich or learned, but rather the reverse, and certainly no limitation of the teaching of the Holy Spirit, without which the Scripture cannot be understood, to them only.

But, notwithstanding the ambiguity of his language, Mr. Newman will hardly dare to deny that the poor and ignorant may understand enough of the Bible to become "wise unto salvation;" we proceed therefore to another insinuation in the same page. Speaking of a standard of faith, he says, "The Bible is this common ground of faith among Protestants, and seems to have been originally assumed in no small degree from a notion of its simplicity in argument." Now, why does Mr. Newman thus attempt to insinuate, after the manner of Gibbon, what he knows very well he cannot prove? but he shall answer himself. "We learn from the testimony of the early Church, that Scripture and Scripture only, is inspired. This explains how it may be called in an especial manner the

Testament or Will of our Lord and Saviour. Scripture has a gift which tradition has not; it is fixed, tangible, accessible, readily applicable, and besides all this, perfectly true in all its parts and relations: in a word it is a sacred text." (P. 346.) Here, then, we have a reason why Protestants took, and continue to take, Scripture as the ground of faith, not "from a notion of its simplicity in argument," but because "Scripture only is inspired," and therefore cannot err: but uninspired men may err and have erred; therefore if we follow them we have no security that we shall receive the truth.

It is true that "the Bible is not so written as to force its meaning upon the reader:" if it were, it would be contrary to the entire analogy of God's dealings with men; we contend only that all will understand as much of it as is necessary for salvation, who will seek the teaching of the Holy Spirit,—a truth which we derive from the Bible itself, and not from any authority of men. When Mr. Newman says (p. 34.), that "no two Protestant sects can agree together whose interpretation of the Bible is to be received," he expresses himself with the same ambiguity which we have already noticed. Protestant sects do agree to a very great extent in their interpretation of the Bible, but no two interpreters will probably be found to agree in every particular, and it rests upon those who would

insinuate that such agreement is necessary, to prove as a first step that it is so; secondly, to shew how Protestants can agree in receiving any one interpretation of Scripture as uniformly accurate, without holding its author infallible; and lastly to shew how they can be justified in assuming what they cannot prove—the infallibility of any man or any body of men. The Papists, with all their pretensions to infallibility, have never, I think, ventured to put forward an infallible interpretation of the Bible.

The notion that "the Bible is the sole authoritative judge in controversies of faith" (p. 35.), will hardly be maintained by reflecting Protestants, certainly not by Chillingworth*, who has clearly shewn that it is inaccurate. The Bible is "not a judge of controversies, but a rule only, and the only rule for Christians to judge them by," a witness or test of the truth, which, as far as is necessary to salvation, none will fail of understanding who adopt the means which the Bible has itself laid down; and the reason why men have differed so widely as to its meaning, is, not because Scripture is not clear enough, but because they are not honest enough in interpreting it. Neither do we say "that that is truth to each which each thinks to be truth, provided he sincerely and really thinks it;" but that is truth which God

* Vol. i. 167. Oxford edition, 1838.

has spoken, and that, God has promised that all shall know,—not absolutely indeed, for "now we see through a glass darkly," but as far as is necessary, who will use the means which He has appointed.*

That we must trust men, in religion as in all other matters to a considerable extent, is undoubtedly true; without it we cannot live; but it does not therefore follow that we are to trust them absolutely, and without reserve. If we do so, what security can we have that our teachers will always be accurate in facts, sound in judgment, and honest in intention? All must trust something; none need or ought to trust everything, for this is to make gods of men.

At page 36. Mr. Newman says, "We do not consider Scripture our sole informant in divine truths." Yet he has admitted, as we have seen, that Scripture only is inspired; and it therefore rests with him to shew, how, without inspiration, any men can be our authoritative informants in divine truths. There are no doctrines, independent of Scripture, which can be distinctly traced on credible evidence to the apostles themselves; and if there were, we have no warrant for holding the extrajudicial sayings, even of the apostles, infallible. St. Paul says, of St. Peter, that he "withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed." † And, in the same epistle to the Gala-

* Luke, xi. 10. † 2 Galat. ii. 11.

tians, he says, "But, though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other Gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." (i. 8.) Nor is this all; for those who assert that there are any divine truths not derived from Scripture must tell us what those truths are, and how they know that they are divine.

Mr. Newman proceeds to dogmatise thus: "We do confute them," that is, other Protestant sects or churches, "with the weapon they have assumed as their own, and we know we do; and we are able to convert others by means of it, though not them, which proves its cogency in our use of it." Mr. Newman forgets that it is just as easy for others to say all this as for himself. His assertion, in the same page, of the adoption, as it appears, for there is no limitation, by all Protestant sects, "of the latitudinarian notion, that one creed is as good as another," is a further instance of that reckless intrepidity as to facts which has been already noticed.

It may be, as Mr. Newman says (p. 37.), that Unitarians profess to appeal to Scripture, but we cannot allow that they receive it as conclusive. This point, however, we shall have an opportunity of reverting to.

Mr. Newman must have felt himself in great distress for an illustration of his hypothesis of tradition, when he had recourse to the following (p. 39.): —

"There is no explicit written law, for instance, simply declaring murder to be a capital offence." The statute 9 Geo. IV. c. 31. s. 3. enacts that "Every person convicted of murder, or of being an accessary before the fact to murder, shall suffer death as a felon." Murder has been a capital offence, by statute, for centuries. The total failure of this illustration signifies indeed nothing to the argument; but it is a specimen, which may not be wholly useless, of Mr. Newman's accuracy.

It appears that Mr. Newman agrees with the theory of tradition, which he has given at p. 40., as that of the Romanists. "The Christian doctrine, as it has proceeded from the mouth of the apostles, is too varied and too minute in its details to be reduced to writing;" and his argument in support of it is also theirs. "To refuse to listen to tradition and antiquity because we have a written word, is a self-destructive course, inasmuch as that written word is plainly proved to be such mainly by these very informants which we reject as if to do honour to it. It is to overthrow our premises with our conclusion. That which ascertains for us the divinity of Scripture, may convey to us other articles of faith also, unless Scripture has expressly determined in the negative." (P. 44.)

Now, in the first place, it is necessary to understand clearly what Mr. Newman and the Romanists

mean, which neither party seems very desirous that we should do. Tradition, according to the quotation from p. 40., is oral only; and if it be meant to insinuate that we receive the Scripture on oral tradition, we unequivocally deny the fact. We do receive Scripture on the authority, or rather on the evidence, of antiquity, that is, of ancient writers, though this is far from being our only ground; "we have also a more sure word of prophecy," and internal evidence, which last in the case of the Bible is irresistible. But it does not follow, because we receive Scripture in a great measure on the authority of ancient writers, that is, because we admit them as witnesses, to prove that they had the same Scripture with ourselves, that we therefore must admit them as authorities in divine truths. It is a fact, not a doctrine, which we admit them to prove. Every person, at all familiar with the subject of evidence, is aware of the distinction between a witness to a fact, and a witness authorised to give his opinion: there is a wide difference between I think and I know. The evidence for the genuineness of Scripture does not differ in kind from that for the genuineness of any other ancient book, of the orations of Cicero or the poems of Horace, for instance; but it differs most materially in degree, for Scripture is supported by a weight of historical authorities which no other ancient book has obtained. We reject the

ancient writers as authorities in matters of doctrine, for more reasons than because we have a written word. We reject them because we have no ground for holding any one of them to be inspired, because they frequently differ from each other, from Scripture, and even from themselves: and to receive conflicting authorities is a "self-destructive course;" because, if we once admit any of them, we cannot determine when and where to stop, and all are agreed in maintaining that some limit there is and must be. Lastly, we reject them because Scripture expressly commands it: "Every word of God is pure: He is a shield unto them that put their trust in him. Add thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar." *

But Mr. Newman again furnishes us with an answer to himself. "The most highly-gifted and religious persons are liable to error, and are not to be implicitly trusted where they profess to be recording, not a fact, but their own opinion.——— Christ alone is the Author and Finisher of Faith in all its senses; His servants do but witness it, and their statements are, then, only valuable when they are testimonies, not deductions or conjectures." (P. 65.)

Neither is it accurate to say that "whatever explanation the Protestant makes in behalf of the preservation of the written word, will be applicable

* Prov. xxx. 5, 6.

in the *theory* to the unwritten." (P. 46.) There is no comparison between the credibility of an oral tradition of very ancient date and that of the Bible. In the case of the tradition, we have no means of knowing that it was not in some degree varied by each successive recipient, so that, for anything we can tell, not even a shadow of a shade of the original may remain to us. In the case of the Bible, the impossibility of forgery is shown by internal evidence; by the fact, that the same Scriptures were very early received by all Christians, and quoted by many writers, living in many countries, at great distances from each other, several of whom suffered tortures and death rather than abjure them. That the evidence for oral tradition *might* be much greater than it is, is doubtless true, it could hardly be less; but we have nothing to do with what might be; our business is with what is.

It is, then, not by authority, but by reason, that we know Scripture to be the word of God. What is the language of our Lord in St. Luke, xii. 57., but an appeal to private judgment? "Yea, and why even of yourselves judge ye not what is right?" It is true, indeed, that to disparage reason is no new thing; the attacks may come from many and even opposing quarters, just as men may maintain opposite opinions, and yet neither party maintain the truth. The language addressed long ago by Hooker

to a very different class of irrationalists, is equally applicable to Mr. Newman and the Papists now.

"In vain it were to speak anything of God, but that by reason men are able somewhat to judge of that they hear, and by discourse to discern how consonant it is to truth.

"Scripture indeed teaches things above nature, things which our reason by itself could not reach unto. Yet those things also we believe, knowing, by reason that the Scripture is the word of God. In the presence of Festus a Roman, and of King Agrippa a Jew, St. Paul omitting the one, who neither knew the Jews' religion, nor the books whereby they were taught it, speaks unto the other of things foreshewed by Moses and the prophets and performed in Jesus Christ; intending thereby to prove himself so unjustly accused, that, unless his judges did condemn both Moses and the prophets, him they could not choose but acquit, who taught only that fulfilled, which they so long since had foretold. His cause was easy to be discerned; what was done their eyes were witnesses; what Moses and the prophets did speak their books could quickly shew; it was no hard thing for him to compare them, which knew the one, and believed the other. 'King Agrippa, believest thou the prophets? I know thou dost.' The question is, how the books of the prophets came to be credited of King Agrippa. For

what with him did authorise the prophets, the like with us doth cause the rest of the Scripture of God to be of credit.

" Because we maintain that in Scripture we are taught all things necessary unto salvation; hereupon, very childishly it is by some demanded, What Scripture can teach us the sacred authority of the Scripture, upon the knowledge whereof our whole faith and salvation dependeth? As though there were any kind of science in the world which leadeth men into knowledge without pre-supposing a number of things already known. No science doth make known the first principles whereon it buildeth, but they are always either taken as plain and manifest in themselves, or as proved and granted already, some former knowledge having made them evident. Scripture teacheth all supernatural revealed truth, without the knowledge whereof salvation cannot be obtained. * The main principle whereupon our belief of all things therein contained dependeth, is, that the Scriptures are the oracles of God himself. This in itself we cannot say is evident. For then all men that hear it would acknowledge it in heart, as they do when they hear that 'every whole is more than any part of that whole,' because this in

* I do not understand Hooker here to deny the possibility of the salvation of the heathen; but only of those to whom revelation has been fairly offered, and who have wilfully rejected it.

itself is evident. The other we know that all do not acknowledge when they hear it. There must be therefore some former knowledge pre-supposed which doth herein assure the hearts of all believers. Scripture teacheth us that saving truth which God hath discovered unto the world by revelation, and it presumeth us taught otherwise that itself is divine and sacred.

" The question then being by what means we are taught this, some answer, that to learn it we have no other way than only tradition; as, namely, that so we believe because both we from our predecessors, and they from theirs, have so received. But is this enough? That which all men's experience teacheth them may not in anywise be denied. And by experience we all know, that the first outward motive leading men so to esteem of the Scripture is the authority of God's Church. For when we know the whole Church of God hath that opinion of the Scripture, we judge it even at the first an impudent thing for any man bred and brought up in the Church to be of a contrary mind without cause. Afterwards the more we bestow our labour in reading or hearing the mysteries thereof, the more we find that the thing itself doth answer our received opinion concerning it. So that the former inducement, prevailing somewhat with us before, doth now much more prevail, when the

very thing hath ministered farther reason. If infidels or atheists chance at any time to call it in question, this giveth us occasion to sift what reason there is, whereby the testimony of the Church concerning Scripture, and our own persuasion which Scripture itself hath confirmed, may be proved a truth infallible. In which case the ancient Fathers being often constrained to shew what warrant they had so much to rely upon the Scriptures, endeavoured still to maintain the authority of the books of God by arguments such as unbelievers themselves must needs think reasonable, if they judged thereof as they should. Neither is it a thing impossible or greatly hard, even by such kind of proofs so to manifest and clear that point, that no man living shall be able to deny it, without denying some apparent principle such as all men acknowledge to be true.

" Wherefore, if I believe the Gospel, yet is reason of singular use, for that it confirmeth me in this my belief the more: if I do not as yet believe, nevertheless to bring me to the number of believers, except reason did somewhat help, and were an instrument which God doth use unto such purposes, what should it boot to dispute with infidels or godless persons for their conversion and persuasion in that point?

" Neither can I think, that when grave and learned

men do sometime hold, that of this principle there is no proof but by the testimony of the Spirit, which assureth our hearts therein, it is their meaning to exclude utterly all force which any kind of reason may have in that behalf; but I rather incline to interpret such their speeches, as if they had more expressly set down, that other motives and inducements, be they never so strong and consonant unto reason, are notwithstanding ineffectual of themselves to work faith concerning this principle, if the special grace of the Holy Ghost concur not to the enlightening of our minds. For otherwise I doubt not but men of wisdom and judgment will grant, that the Church, in this point especially, is furnished with reason to stop the mouths of her impious adversaries; and that as it were altogether bootless to allege against them what the Spirit hath taught us, so likewise that even to our own selves it needeth caution and explication how the testimony of the Spirit may be discerned, by what means it may be known; lest men think that the Spirit of God doth testify those things which the spirit of error suggesteth. The operations of the Spirit, especially those ordinary which be common unto all true Christian men, are as we know things secret and undiscernible even to the very soul where they are, because their nature is of another and an higher kind than that they can be by us

perceived in this life. Wherefore albeit the Spirit lead us into all truth and direct us in all goodness, yet because these workings of the Spirit in us are so privy and secret, we therefore stand on a plainer ground, when we gather by reason from the quality of things believed or done, that the Spirit of God hath directed us in both, than if we settle ourselves to believe or to do any certain particular thing, as being moved thereto by the Spirit.

"But of this enough. To go from the books of Scripture to the sense and meaning thereof: because the sentences which are by the apostles recited out of the Psalms, to prove the resurrection of Jesus Christ, did not prove it, if so be the prophet David meant them of himself; this exposition therefore they plainly disprove, and shew by manifest reason, that of David the words of David could not possibly be meant. Exclude the use of natural reasoning about the sense of Holy Scripture concerning the articles of our faith, and then that the Scripture doth concern the articles of our faith, who can assure us? That, which by right exposition buildeth up Christian faith, being misconstrued, breedeth error: between true and false construction the difference reason must shew. Can Christian men perform that which Peter requireth at their hands? is it possible they should both believe and be able, without the use of reason, to

render 'a reason of their belief,' a reason sound and sufficient to answer them that demand it, be they of the same faith with us or enemies thereunto? May we cause our faith without reason to appear reasonable in the eyes of men?" (*Ecc. Pol.* book iii. c. 8.)

But Mr. Newman would deny the capacity of the great multitude of Protestants to reason at all on the matter. He says (p. 43.) that "the great multitude of uneducated persons are obliged to believe what their instructors tell them." Uneducated persons cannot certainly examine the evidence for the divine authority of Scripture themselves, they must receive the sacred text on the credit of their instructors; but they are obliged to receive nothing else; and if they are really in earnest in the matter, they will not, if they can help it, rely implicitly on their instructors, who may be wrong, for the meaning of Scripture; that they will endeavour to ascertain for themselves; for how can any man love God with all his heart, unless he ardently desires to know what He has spoken, and to do what He has commanded? And is it not the fact, that very many of our poorer and more uneducated classes are "mighty in the Scriptures," esteeming God's Word more highly, and possessing a far clearer perception of its true meaning than many priests of the Church of England?

Mr. Newman thinks that the Romish controversy is more likely to be brought to an end by appealing to antiquity than by appealing to Scripture, although he admits that the writings of antiquity are voluminous, and that "to read them is the work of a life." (P. 48.) But he forgets that he is himself unable to define antiquity, or to say within what period its authority ought to cease; or to give a sufficient reason for so determining the authority of antiquity, having once admitted it; or why, independently of Scripture, certain authors are to be admitted as authorities on some points and rejected on others: the canon of Vincentius Lirinensis is impracticable, as we shall presently see. Such controversies also, like those on texts of Scripture, must necessarily be determined by the meanings of words, and these by reason, to which we must still appeal in the last resort. To suppose that, by widening the field of controversy to an indefinite extent, we are more likely to determine controversies, is a notion so preposterous, that it carries along with it its own refutation.

It may well be, as Mr. Newman maintains (p. 50.), that schism is a sin, but it must be determined by the facts of each particular case, which party incurs the guilt: assuredly it is not always on the seceding side. What was the visible Church before the Reformation, Protestant or Popish? If Popish,

then Protestants seceded; and did they sin in so doing? Was not even Christianity itself a secession from the Jewish Church? Is not rather the sin of schism incurred by any Church or any men who require others to believe what the Bible does not authorise?

"No one," says Mr. Newman, "would ever call a miser liberal; and so no one would call a mere Protestant a Catholic, except an altogether new sense was put on the word to suit a purpose. Romanism has the principle of true Catholicism perverted; popular Protestantism is wanting in the principle." (P. 52.) To call a miser liberal, is a contradiction in terms; to call all Protestants, who have "one Lord, one Faith, and one Baptism," Catholics, is so far from being either this, or a novelty, that, as we have seen, it is the very position maintained by Hooker, whose definition of the word Church Mr. Newman cannot overthrow. There is perhaps not a single Protestant sect, unless the Unitarians, who have neither the same faith nor the same Lord, should by some be heedlessly termed such, which has not a better title to the epithet Catholic than the idolatrous Romanists, as approaching far more nearly than they do to scriptural truth. What Mr. Newman means by "the principle of true Catholicism," which Romanism has and Protestantism has not, he has not explained;

and he will probably find it as difficult to do so as to prove what he has elsewhere said, that our controversy with Romanists relates rather to facts than opinions.

Protestants are little indebted to Mr. Newman for saying that they have pronounced Romanism to be the Antichrist, because "so much may be said for it" (p. 55.); on the contrary, a true Protestant will maintain that there is little difficulty in refuting Romanism, provided the controversy be placed on the right ground. Whether Rome be Antichrist or not is another question, and one which it should seem we are hardly enabled to answer satisfactorily.

The assertion in the same page, that the Church of England agrees with that of Rome in holding "the supernatural grace of the sacraments," is, to say the least, very ambiguous. The grace bestowed on receiving the sacraments is most studiously limited by the Church of England to those who receive them worthily. The doctrine of apostolical succession, limited by Mr. Newman and the Romanists to episcopal ordination only, is not compatible with the nineteenth article of the Church of England.

It is clear from pages 56–7., that Mr. Newman's sympathies lean much more strongly to Popery than to Protestantism. But we cannot admit him to speak for the Church of England, or indeed to

be a member of the Church of England at all, when he says, " The *necessary* difference between us and them," the Romanists, " is not one of essential principle ;" or when he says, not that Popery, but that Protestantism " does not admit of reform," and misplaces its affections on " the systems of men." How can Protestants, who trust in the Bible only, be said to misplace their affections on the systems of men? Mr. Newman objects to others his own sin. Is the authority of antiquity human or divine? If his answer be human, then are his own affections misplaced on the systems of men ; if divine, it must have been inspired, and that he has himself denied.

Mr. Newman's errors are doubly mischievous, as tending, on the one hand, to delude his followers, by persuading them that formal ordinances may be substituted with safety for spiritual realities, and nominal for true religion, thus " speaking peace where there is no peace ;" and on the other, to exasperate his opponents by misrepresentation and injustice, and by condemning them for not receiving what Scripture does not command. What is the former if not heresy? what is the latter if not schism?

CHAP. II.

A CONSIDERABLE portion of Mr. Newman's work is directed against Romanism; but Protestants will give a doubtful welcome to such a defender, not only because he is himself deeply tainted with many of the errors of Rome, but because he places the controversy between the Churches on a false ground, and one on which it can never be determined. Better is an open enemy than a false friend: —

> "Da chi mi fido guardami, Dio,
> Da chi non mi fido mi guarderò io."

Mr. Newman approves of the test of Vincentius Lirinensis, "that that is to be received as apostolic, which has been taught always, every where, and by all." p. 63. Yet this test is clearly distinct from and inconsistent with that proposed by himself in the preceding page.

"Whatever doctrine the primitive ages unanimously attest, whether by consent of fathers, or by councils, or by the events of history, or by controversies, or in whatever way, whatever may fairly and reasonably be considered to be the universal belief of those ages, is to be received as coming

from the Apostles. This canon, as it may be called, rests upon the principle which we act on daily, that what many independent and competent witnesses guarantee, is true. . . . . If it be asked why we do not argue in this way from the existing, as well as from the ancient, Church; we answer, that Christendom now differs from itself in all points, except those in which it is already known to have agreed of old; so that we cannot make use of it if we would." p. 62.

It is obvious that this test or canon, if anything so vague and indistinct can be called by such a name, is not that of Vincentius, for the test of Vincentius embraces all ages of the Church equally; that of Mr. Newman is restricted to "the primitive ages." It can, I think, be readily shewn that both tests are false and mischievous, and first of that of Mr. Newman.

All sound principles of reasoning require that a test, or that by which something else is to be tried, should be itself first determined. Is this done here? Before we are required to believe what the primitive ages only believed, we must determine which are the primitive ages, and within what limits the expression is to be applied. It is clear that our own age is not to be held primitive. Then the primitive ages have ceased; and if so, when did they cease? We must have the precise period, other-

wise we may take that for the primitive faith which really was not so, and we must have a sufficient reason for determining the primitive ages at that precise period. Mr. Newman cannot dispute the validity of this argument, for it is the same with that which he has himself urged successfully against the infallibility of the Church of Rome, p. 148. He denies the infallibility of Rome for this, among other reasons, that the Romanists cannot determine among themselves *where* their supposed infallibility resides; so we ask Mr. Newman, *where* his primitive ages end? And what is his answer? After enumerating many different opinions of different writers, he admits, p. 247., that "the era of purity" cannot be determined within more than 400 years! not "much earlier than the council of Sardica, A. D. 347, nor so late as the second Nicene council, A. D. 787." What can be determined by a test, exclusive or inclusive, we cannot tell which, of all the theological writers of more than four centuries?

Mr. Newman objects to Romanism, that "it neither determines who or what is infallible, or why." p. 146. So we say to himself, he neither determines what his test is, or why we are to adopt it.

Another element of this test is the consent of Fathers. And here again we ask Mr. Newman

why we are to incumber ourselves with such insuperable difficulties? Who are the Fathers? Can we number them like the books of the Bible? Can we certainly distinguish their genuine works from the spurious books attributed to them? Is not the text of some of them corrupt to an extraordinary degree? Is there one among them all wholly free from error? What says Mr. Newman himself? p. 65. "Pope Gregory might be an advocate for a doctrine resembling that of purgatory; St. Gregory Nyssen may have used language available in defence of transubstantiation: St. Ephraim may have invoked the Virgin; St. Austin might believe in their respective predestination of individuals; St. Cyril might afford a handle to Eutyches; Tertullian might be a Montanist; Origen might deny the eternity of future punishment." — It is clear, then, that the Fathers were all fallible men, for they all erred; and why, therefore, are we to hold their authority as superior to that of modern divines? But, it will be said, we are to receive them as an authority only when they agree. Hard, indeed, would be the task of the student in theology, if he had to search through so many ponderous folios (how many, Mr. Newman himself cannot tell), not for the general opinions of their respective authors, but for those opinions only in which they all agree; although he cannot determine who the parties are whose agreement is re-

quired. And, after all, if he may mistake the meaning of the Bible, so also may he that of the Fathers; he may suppose them to agree when they do not: and his prospect of arriving at truth is not greater, but less, than if he confined himself to the Bible only, for the field is widened to an indefinite extent.

But the Fathers, according to Mr. Newman, are to be tried by Catholic tradition, p. 66., and this again by the fact of its apostolic origin. To this we answer, Is there a single doctrine not contained in Scripture, which can be clearly traced on credible evidence to the Apostles? and who is the Apostle to whom such doctrine can he traced? If this cannot be done, tradition is only a mischievous incumbrance; — mischievous, because it is confessedly a mixture of truth and falsehood; and an incumbrance, because it teaches us no religious truth which we have not already drawn from the infallible source of the Bible? Who would drink of the turbid pool when he can quench his thirst with the pure fountain?

The authority of councils, Mr. Newman subjects to private judgment. "Councils or individuals are of authority, when we have reason to suppose they are trustworthy informants of apostolical tradition." p. 64. Apostolical tradition is a high-sounding term, but here it really means only what one man tells another. Traditions are not apostolical,

unless they can be traced to the Apostles. But whether councils or individuals are trustworthy informants or not, we judge by reason, which, disguise it as we may, is necessarily and unavoidably the final tribunal whereunto all parties must appeal. Whatever can be proved from Scripture, we are ready to receive, not merely on the authority of Fathers or councils, but on that of any man in any age.

I pass the farther discussion of the competence of the Fathers to prove anything more, as witnesses, than the fact that their Scriptures were the same with ours. Suffice it to observe, that Mr. Newman has assumed their competence as doctrinal authorities, independent of Scripture, without any proof.

As to the reason given for excluding the authority of the existing Church, that "Christendom now differs from itself in all points, except those in which it is already known to have agreed of old;" it is rather an assertion than an argument. The exception is incorrect. Christendom differed of old and differs now; on which side the more or less of difference lies is a matter of opinion which may be disputed; and as long as the fact of difference both now and of old is admitted, the questionable test of more or less, as a ground for assuming the presence or absence of authority, is as vague as can well be imagined.

The objection to the test of Vincentius is, that unless the exceptions are to be held greater than the rule, it is wholly impracticable. It is not in the power of any man to search all the works of all the theological writers of eighteen centuries, in order to ascertain what opinions only were held by all of them. Doubtless, if such a search were made, a certain uniformity would be discovered; and the reason is obvious, — because theological writers in every age have always derived something from Scripture, the source of their unanimity as far as it exists, but from whence no one writer, in any age, can be proved never to have departed. Mr. Newman admits, indeed, that this test can never be fully satisfied, p. 69.; but he has alleged nothing in its favour, but what may be urged with equal force by the Romanists in favour of infallibility. Butler's argument in his admirable Analogy, is wholly foreign to the matter in point. The question is, whether, having the Bible, we are to do what is equivalent to discarding it, because we may mistake its meaning in matters not essential to salvation; (for we are well assured that, in essentials, none will ever mistake it who will study it in a right spirit;) and substitute in its stead a test of truth admitted to be indefinite, and in strictness impracticable. The insufficiency of the Bible is assumed, in express contradiction to the Bible itself, and volumes innu-

merable substituted for it, none free from the very objection made to the Bible, if objection it can be called, the possibility of mistaking whatever is conveyed through the medium of words, which *, "after all, have a distinct meaning in spite of sophistry," and liable, in addition, to faults of their own, from which the Bible is entirely free. Mr. Newman has nothing in common here with Butler, but he has with the Utilitarians, who would substitute for a moral sense an impracticable analysis of all the tendencies of all human actions, just as he, and that, too, inconsistently with himself, would substitute for the Bible the impracticable test of the agreement of all theological writers.

But Mr. Newman will say that it is unjust to impute to him the intention of substituting tradition for Scripture, that he denies Scripture to none, but denies only to individuals the liberty of interpreting it. The interpretation is the whole question. Hear Chillingworth: —

"He that would usurp an absolute lordship and tyranny over any people, need not put himself to the trouble and difficulty of abrogating and disannulling the laws made to maintain the common liberty; for he may frustrate their intent, and compass his own design as well, if he can get the power and authority to interpret them as he pleases, and

* Lectures, p. 70.

add to them what he pleases, and to have his interpretations and additions stand for laws; if he can rule his people by his laws, and his laws by his lawyers. So the Church of Rome, to establish her tyranny over men's consciences, needed not either to abolish or corrupt the Holy Scriptures, the pillars and supporters of Christian liberty; (which, in regard of the numerous multitude of copies dispersed through all places, translated into almost all languages, guarded with all solicitous care and industry, had been an impossible attempt;) but the more expedite way, and therefore more likely to be successful, was to gain the opinion and esteem of the public and authorised interpreters of them, and the authority of adding to them what doctrine she pleased, under the title of traditions or definitions. For by this means she might both serve herself of all those clauses of Scripture which might be drawn to cast a favourable countenance upon her ambitious pretences, which, in case the Scripture had been abolished she could not have done; and yet be secure enough of having either her power limited, or her corruptions and abuses reformed by them; this being once settled in the minds of men, —That unwritten doctrines, if proposed by her, were to be received with equal reverence to those that were written; and that the sense of Scripture was not that which seemed to men's reason and under-

standing to be so, but that which the Church of Rome should declare to be so, seemed it never so unreasonable and incongruous." Vol. i. p. 157. ed. Oxford, 1838.*

Mr. Newman seems to think that whatever we find received early and generally in the Church, with a silence concerning its introduction, must have been appointed by the Apostles. p. 63. This is requiring belief without evidence. Such matters, whether doctrines, rites, or ceremonies, may, for any thing we can tell, have been introduced by heretics, as well as by the Apostles; and even if they could be traced directly to some specific Apostle, they would not necessarily be binding upon Christians, because they would be, if doctrines, additions to Scripture, and therefore "accursed †," and if rites or ceremonies, although both apostolic and scriptural, not immutable, as Hooker clearly shews; "for laws are instruments to rule by; and instruments are not only to be framed according unto the general end for which they are provided, but even according unto that very particular which riseth out of the matter whereon they have to work." And again, "Laws, though both ordained of God himself, and

* It is somewhat remarkable, that in this edition of Chillingworth, the characteristic title of his famous work, "The Religion of Protestants a safe Way to Salvation," is omitted.

† *Galat.* i. 8.

the end for which they were ordained continuing, may notwithstanding cease, if by alterations of persons or times they be found insufficient to attain unto that end. In which respect why may we not presume that God doth even call for such change or alteration as the very condition of things themselves doth make necessary?

"They which do therefore plead the authority of the law-maker as an argument, wherefore it should not be lawful to change that which he hath instituted, and will have this the cause why all the ordinances of our Saviour are immutable; they which urge the wisdom of God as a proof, that whatsoever laws he hath made, they ought to stand, unless himself from heaven proclaim them disannulled, because it is not in man to correct the ordinance of God; may know, if it please them to take notice thereof, that we are far from presuming to think that men can better any thing which God hath done, even as we are from thinking that men should presume to undo some things of men, which God doth know they cannot better. God never ordained any thing that could be bettered. Yet many things he hath that have been changed, and that for the better. That which succeedeth as better now when change is requisite, had been worse when that which now is changed was instituted. Otherwise God had not then left this to choose that, neither would now re-

ject that to choose this were it not for some new-grown occasion, making that which hath been better worse. In this case therefore men do not presume to change God's ordinance, but they yield thereunto requiring itself to be changed."

But "we are to believe for ever the articles of evangelical doctrine, the matter of faith is constant, the matter contrariwise of action daily changeable, especially the matter of action belonging unto church polity. Neither can I find that men of soundest judgment have any otherwise taught, than that articles of belief, and things which all men must of necessity do to the end they may be saved, are either expressly set down in Scripture, or else plainly thereby to be gathered. But touching things which belong to discipline and outward polity, the Church hath authority to make canons, laws, and decrees, even as we read that in the Apostles' times it did. Which kind of laws (forasmuch as they are not in themselves necessary to salvation) may, after they are made, be also changed as the difference of times or places shall require."— *Eccl. Pol.* book iii. c. 10.

We "stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free *;" we conclude that "the Church hath power to decree rites and ceremonies †; the Church may substitute presbytery for episcopacy, or episcopacy for presbytery, as circum-

* Galat. v. 1. † Art. XX.

stances may require; the state may take back what the state has given, observing only to wrong no man; but the Christian Faith, no Fathers, no councils, no Pope, no Church can increase or diminish at all. Of that Faith, God is the Finisher, no less than the Author; and "whatsoever God doeth, it shall be for ever: nothing can be put to it, nor any thing taken from it: and God doeth it, that men should fear before him." * Marvellous indeed is the sufficiency of the Bible for all emergencies, and little has any man to fear, who is content to rest his faith on the Bible, and on that alone, from the combined attacks of superstition, infidelity, fanaticism, and latitudinarianism, in all their shades! How refreshing, after long wandering in the barren wastes of theological controversy, to repose beneath "the shadow of that great rock in a weary land!"

When, therefore, Mr. Newman conjectures, that "the doctrine of what is familiarly called Church and King is apostolic," the remark is worse than idle, and that for more reasons than one. The union of Church and State is not a doctrine at all. It is not a matter of faith, it is not to be found in Scripture, and if it could be proved to be apostolic, it would not therefore, as we have seen, be necessarily binding on Christians. If the union of Church and State had been necessary, it might have been so

* Ecclesiastes, iii. 14.

ordered from the very first; but it was not; what is now called the voluntary system lasted three centuries, and those, it is commonly supposed, the purest. It is true that the union of Church and State has now lasted fifteen. Yet, when he considers the many wars, treasons, conspiracies, massacres, violations of all laws human and divine, tortures of the holiest and most virtuous men, beyond what it might have been supposed the most malignant could conceive, or the most remorseless endure to execute, wherewith this union may be fairly charged; before admitting that an institution, the source of such frightful miseries, and of such enormous crimes, is indeed of divine commandment, every honest and reflecting man will surely pause. Besides, there is much which we know to be apostolic not received by the Church of England.

"Our end," says Hooker, "ought always to be the same; our ways and means thereunto not so. The glory of God and the good of his Church was the thing which the Apostles aimed at, and therefore ought to be the mark whereat we also level. But seeing those rights and orders may be at one time more which at another are less available unto that purpose, what reason is there in these things to urge the state of one only age as a pattern for all to follow? It is not I am right sure their meaning, that we should now assemble our people to serve

God in close and secret meetings; or that common brooks or rivers should be used for places of baptism; or that the Eucharist should be administered after meat; or that the custom of church feasting should be renewed; or that all kind of standing provision for the ministry should be utterly taken away, and their estate made again dependent upon the voluntary devotion of men. In these things they easily perceive how unfit that were for the present, which was for the first age convenient enough."—*Eccl. Pol.* book iv. c. 2.

With what consistency, then, can we be required to receive some matters of Church polity, rites, or ceremonies, because they may be apostolic, when we reject others which we know to be apostolic? Must we receive them on the authority of the Church? then we set the authority of the Church above that of the Apostles, because all that the Apostles ordered we do not receive. There is but one way of extricating ourselves from the difficulty. We receive or reject matters of church polity, rites, and ceremonies, not on authority, but because they are fit or unfit for our own circumstances and times, and such their fitness or unfitness reason only can shew.

It is a satisfaction, after having had so much to object to Mr. Newman, to find something in which we can join:

"Faith differs from opinion, in its considering the being, governance, and will of God as a matter of personal interest and importance to us, not in the degree of light or darkness under which it perceives these truths." p. 104. This is true as far as it goes, but it is not the whole truth; for a saving faith implies trust, as well as belief and personal interest. He objects also to the doctrine of infallibility, that it necessarily infers completeness as well as certainty of knowledge, because in infallibility there can be no degrees; it infers more than was possessed, as appears from Scripture, even by the Apostles themselves, who were not absolutely infallible, though the Bible is, for "to the rest speak I, not the Lord, I have no commandment of the Lord, yet I give my judgment*," says St. Paul. Vast indeed is the inconsistency, presumption, and folly whereunto this assumption of unerring knowledge in things divine has led! Infallibility binds together and gives enduring consistence to all the heresies and corruptions of Rome. It renders all reform impossible, and cuts off all retreat from any error once advanced: it is the most insolent and the most groundless of all the "accursed" additions which men have made to God's word: it is self-contradictory, for none can determine who or what is infallible, or why; and no truth is more certain than that all men, both individually and col-

* 1 Cor. vii. 12—25.

lectively, have erred both in thought and act: it takes away that trial of our faith, which it is most clear from Scripture that God designed; which is in strict conformity with all His dealings with us; that trial, both moral and religious, which is inseparable from our condition as responsible agents, and which it is a folly of all the chiefest to think we can elude or transfer to others.

Mr. Newman justly objects to the Romanists that they would make religion a system; but, as we have seen, he is not himself free from the same charge. In his enumeration of matters we do not know, he says (p. 112.) "We do not know what will be the future destiny, whether of happiness or misery, of the body of baptized persons, who certainly seem to live and die in an unchristian way." It appears, however, that this is a point which Mr. Newman does know, for elsewhere he says, "Grace without repentance is pledged to the ordinances of the Church Catholic *." (P. 249.) What says the Scripture?— "The wicked shall be turned into hell:" — there is no exception of the baptized wicked. "Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity."

* In Romans, xi. 29. it is said "the gifts and calling of God are without repentance." But what has this to do with the Church? Is the Church to usurp what belongs to God? The Church does, indeed, seem to be the god of Mr. Newman's idolatry, although, as he frequently uses the word, it appears to be little more than an unreal abstraction.

Our Lord's saying of the wicked Pharisees, in those days members of the visible Church, as wicked men baptized are now, is yet more express, "It shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrha in the day of judgment than for you." Mr. Newman's first remark is most mischievous, and decidedly Antinomian in its tendency; the second is pure Antinomianism. To affect even to doubt whether men may live and die in sin, and yet be saved because they are baptized, is a most grievous breach of trust in a Christian minister, and alone sufficient to justify his expulsion from the Church of England. If Mr. Newman seeks to shelter himself under the equivocal word "seem," then we answer, he should substitute "mankind" for "baptized persons;" and still the sentence would require considerable qualification to render it harmless. Yet, this most mischievous doctrine is but a consequence of confounding baptism with regeneration; the sign with the thing signified!

Neither can Mr. Newman be suffered to say that the Romanists "consider *with us* that baptism is a plenary and absolute remission of all sin whatever, original and actual, with which the baptized person is laden." (P. 113.) He must speak for himself. The Church of England holds no such doctrine; the Church of England expressly limits all the benefits of baptism to those that receive it "rightly." (Art. XXVII.)

It has been already shewn that the Articles are a higher authority in this matter than the baptismal service, especially when the former are in accordance with Scripture, and the latter contrary to it. Is there any thing more certain in Scripture than that sin cannot be forgiven without repentance and without faith? Yet baptism may be received without either.

Among the assertions in which Mr. Newman so often indulges without proving, may be numbered the following: — "In the religion popular among us at the present day only so much of the high doctrines of the Gospel is admitted as is seen and felt to tend to our moral improvement." (P. 118.) Let the Gospel doctrines excluded be specified. For my part I will not assert, but I believe, that all the doctrines of the Gospel were never more truly and more generally preached in England than they have been in this nineteenth century. Wherever some are intentionally withheld, to use the singularly elegant language of our author on another occasion, "Christian holiness loses its freshness, vigour, and comeliness, being frozen as it were into certain attitudes, which are not graceful except when unstudied."

At (p. 135.) we observe Mr. Newman calls the Book of Tobit Scripture, although it is expressly excluded from the canon by the Church of England.

We come now to the question of private judg-

ment. Mr. Newman having successfully combated the Romish doctrine of infallibility, dreading the opposite extreme of reason, sets up an intermediate theory of his own, which, as we shall see, is not tenable if his own arguments against infallibility are sound. We have said a theory of his own, because we deny it to be, as Mr. Newman calls it, the doctrine of the Church of England, although he not very consistently allows, that "it has never been realised in any religious community." (P. 154.) He says, that the Church of England "considers that on certain definite subjects private judgment upon the text of Scripture has been superseded, but not by the mere authoritative sentence of the Church, but by its historical testimony delivered down from the apostles' time." (P. 152.) And here we cannot but observe the singularly unsystematic arrangement of Mr. Newman's treatise. He does not proceed by steps from one proof to another, but he perpetually assumes what he has to prove; he continually repeats himself; and so mixes up assertion and conjecture with argument, that in replying to him we are unavoidably compelled to occupy a much greater space than the nature of the case really requires. It would, for instance, have shortened this discussion, if, instead of asserting that the Church of England "considers private judgment on certain definite subjects su-

perseded," he had given the words of the Church of England which he thus interprets, as it is not easy to discover where they are to be found; and if he had also enumerated specifically all such "certain definite subjects," and stated where such enumeration was to be found.

What the doctrine of our Church on this matter really is, we find in the sixth article. "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation."

There is not a word here of "superseding private judgment," of "the authoritative sentence of the Church," or of "historical testimony." "But," says Mr. Newman, "this statement is very plain and clear except in one point, namely, who is to be the *judge* what is and what is not contained in Scripture." (P. 319.) According to him antiquity is to be the judge (p. 325.); but, as we have seen, he cannot determine what antiquity is; the Church he admits not to be a judge but a witness (p. 320.); and so far we agree with him, though we deny the unintelligible distinction between the Church and antiquity: and to say that antiquity is a judge without determining what antiquity is, or distinguishing it from the Church, is to say that it is

and is not a judge in the same breath; for it is a condition precedent to a decision, that some definite person should pronounce it. How can we submit to any judgment when we do not know whether to exclude from or include among our judges all the theological writers of more than 400 years? How can we arrive at any definite conclusion from indefinite premises? How can we arrive at any conclusion from premises so extensive that no man's life is long enough to master them? And lastly, why are we to take for our judges in matters of faith men confessedly fallible, and of these some, and not others, in express contradiction to the words of our Lord, who tells us, that to "teach for doctrines the commandments of men," is to "worship God in vain?"

It is clear, then, that antiquity cannot be a judge; besides, that the addition to the article of "proved thereby to the satisfaction of antiquity," would be manifestly absurd. The church is admitted to be only a witness, and such is obviously the meaning of the article, for the Church takes upon herself the burden of proof; if she is required to prove to her own satisfaction only, the word "proved" is redundant, for a witness must be presumed already convinced of the truth of what he is to prove. To say to others, "You must believe what is proved to my satisfaction," is to speak from authority; not as

a witness, but as a judge. The word "proved" must have some meaning, and unless it refers to a third party, distinct from the party proving, it cannot be shewn to have any. Then the question arises, who that third party is? and if neither antiquity or the Church, supposing them, for the sake of the argument, distinct, it can only be the party mentioned in the latter portion of the sentence, viz. any man who is required to believe. Besides, as Mr. Newman says, "all parties must be agreed, that without private judgment there is no responsibility" (p. 155.); and no man can transfer his own responsibility to others. "The soul that sinneth it shall die."

We conclude therefore that the Church of England, so far from superseding private judgment, requires no man to believe what is not proved from Scripture to his satisfaction; and this is to authorise private judgment; but it is a very grave question for every man, whether he deals fairly with himself in this matter, whether he really receives every doctrine which he cannot deny that Scripture contains, however opposed to his own prejudices, his ordinary course of life, or his most cherished opinions. We do not say that every man is required to believe every doctrine which may be proved from Scripture; for in scriptural knowledge, as in all other matters, to some much is given, and

to others little; and God is a just judge; but every man in a Christian country is required to believe Scripture to be God's word, "and to do his best endeavour to find the true sense of it*;" and no man can reject without sin any doctrine which he really believes Scripture to contain. A catalogue of essentials we cannot give, "because none that can be given can universally serve for all men, God requiring more of them to whom he gives more, and less of them to whom he gives less, and consequently that may be fundamental and necessary to one which to another is not so." *

Men have fallen into endless absurdities by attempting to deprive others of the use of their understandings, which is the real meaning of denying private judgment. Besides, in fact, it cannot be done. The only question is, at what point the exercise of the understanding is to begin. If it were possible for a man to go so far as to believe every thing that every body told him, still he must first know what every body says; he must interpret to himself the meaning of the words he hears before he can believe them, and so far exercise private judgment. If men take their opinions not from the Bible, but from what their priest tells them the Bible means, they must first understand what the priest says; and, if moreover, the lay members of

* Chillingworth, vol. i. p. 322.

the Church of England believe every thing that every priest tells them, they will believe many contradictory opinions. Why then are we not to begin at the Bible, the foundation which alone is infallibly sure, since, if we begin any where else, we have no security that we shall not believe what is false? They who trust to men and not to the Bible, do so at their peril. They may, indeed, believe what they please, and trust to whom they please; but divest themselves of their personal responsibility, both for what they think, as well as for what they do, they never can. But fearful indeed is the increase of responsibility which they incur who would allow others to receive no interpretations of the word of God but theirs!

Mr. Newman calls upon us to receive all aids, both internal and external, in forming our judgment on religion. (P. 156.) We receive all, we reject none, but we deny any to be of authority except the Bible. And yet it is certain that all aids, both external and internal, will be unavailing without the teaching of God's Holy Spirit. No man can have a saving faith, "no man can say that Jesus is the Lord but by the Holy Ghost." There is nothing narrowing in this doctrine. The teaching of the Spirit we know will be given to all who really ask it. "If ye being evil," says our Lord, "know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much rather

shall my heavenly Father give his Holy Spirit to them that ask him!" Yet certainly it would not be safe for any man to argue that a doctrine is scriptural because he conceives that he has been taught it personally by the Holy Spirit. It is, perhaps, the most spiritual of all English divines who says, in a passage already quoted, "the operations of the Spirit, especially those ordinary which be common unto all true Christian men, are, as we know, things secret and undiscernible even to the very soul where they are." * And therefore it is that we are commanded in Scripture to "be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you with meekness and fear." †

Mr. Newman contradicts himself, Scripture, reason, and the Church of England, when he calls all informants indiscriminately "divine." (P. 158.) He has admitted already that "Scripture only is inspired," and all other informants, therefore, excepting Scripture and the Spirit, must be human. Besides, no man can consult all informants, for life is not long enough to do it; and none are commanded to consult any, excepting Scripture and the Holy Spirit. To receive any informants as authorities, excepting these last, is to add to Scripture, and to raise human means to an equality with divine.

* Hooker, *ante.* † 1 Peter, iii. 15.

"Scripture, antiquity, and catholicity," says Mr. Newman, "cannot really contradict each other" (P. 160.) Then antiquity and catholicity must be infallible; but in fact they do contradict each other, for there have always been, as Mr. Newman well knows, many different opinions in the Church, and therefore, antiquity and catholicity, which, as we have seen, cannot be distinguished, are not infallible, and therefore not safe guides.

It is idle in Mr. Newman, to tell us "to follow antiquity;" he must first shew what antiquity is, and then why we are to follow it; otherwise, his own argument against infallibility is unsound. As to the notion, that "it is pious to sacrifice our own opinion to that of the Church" (p. 161.), although it is true that a man had better not dissent from the religion he has been taught for a slight cause, yet, without material qualification, it is mere superstition, and incompatible with the love of truth, which God requires of us. If such a sacrifice is an act of piety, why is Mr. Newman a Protestant, even in name? The reformers did not think it pious to sacrifice their opinions to those of the then existing Church. It is most dishonest in Mr. Newman to put forth these and similar extravagances as the doctrines of the Church of England! Instead of "forbearing to scrutinise" (p.162.), we are expressly commanded to "search the Scriptures." Doubtless, in this country

men are taught religion before they are able to search; and to this no one I suppose will object: but when they are able, if they are in earnest, they will search; if they are not in earnest, it matters little what they do. Mr. Newman furnishes a ready excuse for the indifferent.

I know not who the persons are, of whom Mr. Newman speaks, who consider "that Almighty God has left them entirely to their own efforts." (P.164.) God has given us his Word, and reason wherewith to understand it, and he has promised the teaching of his Holy Spirit to all who ask it; how then can he be said to have left any who receive all this, although in religion they receive nothing else, to themselves? Why should they put their trust in the Church; can the Church save them?

It is doubtless true that "men continually misinterpret Scripture" (p. 166.); but the chief reason why they do so is not given, which is, because they do not study it in a right spirit; and we know from Scripture that the condition of mind which Scripture requires is given at least as often to "the foolish things of the world" as to those who think themselves the wise, "for it is written, he taketh the wise in their own craftiness." Mr. Newman rightly objects to the Romanists, that, because men may misinterpret, they are not therefore without all power of interpreting, any more than it follows that,

because men may and do argue falsely, that they therefore cannot argue justly. Yet this is the fallacy of all those who childishly argue against the use of argument, against the use of any thing from the abuse of it. We agree then with the premises, but assuredly they will bear a much stronger conclusion than that which our author derives from them, viz., "that we think no harm can come from putting the Scriptures into the hands of the laity." "No harm"! and is this all Mr. Newman has to say for the pure word of the All-wise God? the only religious book in the world which we know to be absolutely and infallibly true; which teaches truths above man's knowledge, in words above man's eloquence; which contains the purest morality the world has ever seen; "which is able to make us wise unto salvation, through Christ Jesus!" Not merely is it "no harm" to read it, but to neglect it wilfully is a deadly sin. What will it avail any one at the great day of account, when he stands before Him who was his Creator, who might have been his Redeemer, but who will then be his Judge, charged with having "loved darkness rather than light," to answer, that he trusted not God but man?

But "the general reading of the Bible has brought into our country and Church all kinds of heresies and extravagances." (P. 167.) Again, we say, that if men may and have perverted the Bible, so they

may, and have perverted every thing else. Would the dishonest men who perverted the Bible, (for a truly honest mind, by God's assistance, cannot pervert it fatally,) have found nothing else to pervert if the Bible had been denied them? The Bible was denied to men for many centuries, and what was then the state of society? "The earth was filled with violence." And when the rich and powerful became at length susceptible of remorse, how did they think to atone for their crimes? Not by restitution to those they had wronged; not by repentance and faith in Christ; but by barren pilgrimages, building monasteries, and murdering those whom they called heretics, but whose creed was usually purer than their own. They were taught to atone for blood by blood.

By withholding the Bible, even unity of opinion is not obtained; for what were the disputes between Jesuits and Dominicans, Jesuits and Jansenists, but differences of opinion? and religion, under such circumstances, either degenerates into superstition, which is heresy, or is wholly blotted out by infidelity, which is worse. Notwithstanding our many differences, is there any Popish country where so many truly religious persons are to be found as in England?

One cause of schism then is a dishonest spirit in the schismatic; another cause, we shall soon see, —

but we are wholly at issue with Mr. Newman both as to the cause and the remedy. "If Scripture reading has, in England, been the cause of schism, it is because we are deprived of the power of excommunicating, which, in the revealed scheme, is the formal antagonist and curb of private judgment." (P. 168.)

There is here an ambiguity in the word "excommunication," which it is necessary to point out. Every society of men, whether religious, moral, or for whatever object it may be formed, has necessarily in itself an inherent power of excluding any of its members for such conduct as either the whole body, or the representatives of that body, duly authorised, may disapprove. We claim for "a congregation of faithful men *," which is the definition of the visible Church given by the Church of England, the same power which other societies possess; but we claim no more; and the word excommunication may mean a great deal more. The Church of Rome, by excommunication, intends the exclusion of the excommunicated from heaven, a sentence which it is abominable presumption and blasphemy for any man or men, whether individually or collectively, to suppose that they are able to pass. This is another of the many wicked additions to Scripture of that apostate Church. The man

* Art. XIX.

excommunicating may err as well as the man excommunicated: nay, he may be, for any thing we can tell, a much more hateful object in the sight of God than his fellow. The apostles held "the keys of the kingdom of heaven" * only when they were infallible, only when they read men's hearts, as in the case of Ananias and Sapphira, because "they were filled with the Holy Ghost;" but no such power is any where promised to fallible men, and it is monstrous to suppose it.

One of the greatest defects of the Church of England is certainly a good system of discipline, which implies the power of excluding the erring members of its own body. But it may be that the very men who are most anxious to exercise this power against others may have most reason to dread it themselves.

But if schism be a sin, which we do not deny, is it not schismatical in men to require of others, as matter of faith, what God has not required? Is not the guilt of schism incurred not by him who rejects, but by him who "teaches for doctrines the commandments of men?" Let those who maintain the contrary answer Chillingworth: "For whosoever requires harder or heavier conditions of men than God requires of them, he it is that is properly an enemy of the Church's universality, by hindering

* Matt. xvi. 19. xviii. 18.

either men or countries from adjoining themselves to it; which, were it not for these unnecessary and therefore unlawful conditions, in probability would have made them members of it." (Vol. i. p. 384.)

Mr. Newman would have "a Church which taught the truth boldly and in system." (P. 168.) All these requisites he cannot have, but as to two of them, such a Church there is, and it is that of Rome, which teaches "boldly and in system," but not the truth. Boldness and systematising are the very objections he has himself made to Rome, in his Lecture on Infallibility. The boldness of Romanists "intruding into those things which they have not seen, vainly puffed up by their fleshly mind," is condemned by St. Paul, no less distinctly than their forbidding to marry, and praying in a tongue not understood of the people. From such boldness we trust the Church of England will be preserved; and as to teaching the truth as a system, Mr. Newman has already shewn in the same lecture, that the Church does not know the truth as a system, and therefore cannot so teach it. Religion is not a system at all, and they who have succeeded in giving it in some degree a systematic appearance, have only done so because they have not scrupulously adhered to truth.

"One chief cause of sects among us is," *not* "that the Church's voice is not heard clearly and

forcibly," but because the Church is, in some matters, "too bold and peremptory," and requires from men what God has not required. The Church of England is free from the sin of schism as regards Romanists, but she is not free from the sin of schism, nor yet from blood-guiltiness, witness the atrocious persecution of the Scotch Covenanters, as regards Protestants.

Mr. Newman manifests the usual inconsistency of all irrationalists at p. 169. He admits that the clergy do not "think alike," but he conceives they would, if they studied antiquity; when, as it is clear even from his own book, men did not think alike either, and moreover were not always even consistent with themselves, any more than they are now. There is not a single age since the apostles, in which it can be proved that the clergy all thought alike, nor is it probable that they ever will, while human nature remains the same. "Men differ from each other," much more from internal than from external causes, because their minds are different as well as their faces, and therefore the same matters do not affect different minds in the same way. Men must be content to differ, or employ force, and force may produce hypocritical uniformity, but never real unity, as Chillingworth has clearly proved; and they who are ambitious to thrust upon the public their mischievous and obso-

lete sophisms, had better first study the arguments of that closest of reasoners, and answer them if they can. Force is a carnal, and not a Christian weapon, and all that it can do for men is to make narrower the narrow way to Heaven, and broader the broad way to Hell.

It is, perhaps, true, that men can hardly engage in controversy without sustaining some moral injury, and yet controversy is necessary, for without it our interest languishes, and we grow indifferent to truth. A really honest mind, unless weak or ignorant, will be slow to theorise; but if we concede honesty to an ardent theorist, we must not be too ready to condemn him for resorting occasionally to artifices, of which, perhaps, in the heat of his argument, he is himself unconscious. Of such artifices, one of the most familiar is the mis-representing the opinions of opponents, and arguing against the assumed opinion, as if it were the real one. We cannot acquit our author of this charge in the following passage (p. 173.): —

"There is something so very strange and wild in maintaining that every individual Christian, rich and poor, learned and unlearned, young and old, in order to have an intelligent faith, must have formally examined, deliberated, and passed sentence upon the meaning of Scripture for himself, and that in the highest and most delicate and mysterious matters

of faith, that I am unable either to discuss, or even to impute such an opinion to another, in spite of the large and startling declarations which men make on the subject."

Now we do contend, not only for the right, but also for the duty of private judgment, but certainly not for the preposterous notion that all men must examine to the same extent, however various the character of their minds, their capacities, or endowments, whether natural or acquired. If any persons have put forth such wild notions on the subject of private judgment, it would have been but candid in Mr. Newman to have told us who they are. Any man who has reflected but ever so little on the matter must surely see that the standard of private judgment, like the standard of essentials, must vary according to the character and capacity of the individual who is to exercise it; and it is just as reasonable to say that nothing is essential, because the standard of essentials is admitted to be variable, as to say that the duty of private judgment does not exist, because it cannot be exercised by all to the same extent. The question is, not whether all persons can exercise private judgment to the same extent, for we maintain no such absurdity, but whether any persons, capable of being responsible agents, are justified in refusing to exercise private judgment to any the least extent. This last proposition Mr.

Newman has not proved, and so far is he from being able to prove it, that he cannot do so without maintaining, what is necessarily implied in the denial of the duty of private judgment on the part of a responsible agent, and yet manifestly absurd, viz., that the responsibility of men is less than their power.

That all responsible agents have the power of examining to some extent, we shall endeavour to shew. In this country, at the present day, there are it is to be hoped few, if any families, of which some one member at the least is not able to read, and occasionally, if not constantly, to attend some place of divine worship. They who neglect to attend any place of divine worship, in so doing, sin, and for such sin they are responsible. There are, I trust, few places of worship in England, where the Bible is not frequently mentioned and referred to. Any person, however ignorant, if only an attendant at a place of worship, and hearing the Bible mentioned with reverence, if in earnest about religion, and if not in earnest, it matters little what he is, would naturally feel anxious to become better acquainted with it, and the facilities now afforded for such an object, by the Church of England, and by the various other Protestant Churches, are so great, that we are warranted in saying, that all persons, whom the law treats as responsible agents, may become acquainted

with the Bible if they choose. An uneducated man must take for granted that the Bible is true, and rightly translated, but the best educated man must take some things for granted also; the difference between them is of degree only, not of kind. We will suppose, then, an uneducated man reading the Bible, or, if he cannot read, hearing it read to him, not as a form merely, but earnestly desiring to know the truth,—can he so read, or so listen, without sometimes comparing in his own mind what the Bible says, with what he has heard from others on the subject of religion? and if he so compares, must he not, to some extent, for the more or the less is not the question, exercise private judgment? To some extent he has the power, and wherever there is power, there must be duty. The difference between men's minds is great, doubtless, but yet not so vast as the arrogant suppose.

What has been said hitherto would apply to any book not scientific, and written for the most part in clear language. But the Bible appeals at least as much to the heart, the will, the affections, or by whatever other name we choose to designate the same thing, as to the understanding; and all men have hearts. "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness;" an expression no less philosophically accurate than divinely true; for faith in Scripture, excepting in the Epistle of St. James, where it

clearly signifies belief only, such as that of devils, without trust, wherever it is spoken of as justifying, means both belief and trust; and though we believe with the understanding, we trust with the will. Therefore is it said in another passage, "My son, give me thy heart;" that is, a heart which desires what God desires, and which entirely trusts that what He has promised He will perform; and such a heart, we say, on most clear scriptural authority, is a divine gift, though we deny not that men may "resist the Holy Ghost," as the Jews did of old. There is nothing mystical in this doctrine, but it is humbling to human pride; for its effect is to place Christianity within the reach of all, rich or poor, learned or unlearned, young or old, of all to whom God has given "an understanding heart," which he has promised he will give to all who ask it with a real love of truth, humility, and prayer.

How far the inhabitants of Popish, Mahometan, and Heathen countries, are responsible for believing falsehood, is a question which can be answered only by determining how far they are incapacitated by character or circumstances from believing the truth. As far as they are really incapacitated, I cannot think that they are responsible, but whether their incapacities are absolutely invincible or only imaginary, is a question between their Creator and their own souls. Any man may unwittingly believe

a lie, but no man need love a lie; all such are "without," with "murderers and idolaters."

Mr. Newman would maintain that "accuracy of mind" is the chief requisite for understanding Scripture (p. 175.); we say, "truth in the inward parts." Men who would understand the Bible, whether learned or unlearned, must love truth for its own sake; if they do so love truth, by God's grace they will understand the Bible, though unlearned; if they do not, however great their learning, or powerful their intellects, they never will. The doctrine of the atonement for instance, we do maintain to be the very foundation of Christianity; we cannot admit the title of any who deny it to the name of Christian, yet what is it but an entire trust in the merits and sacrifice of Christ alone for salvation? We believe that no person whom the law of England considers a responsible agent is incapable of understanding and believing thus much, and that every person who can so embrace the atonement will be saved. But, it must be observed, that so to embrace the atonement necessarily implies a deep conviction and a forsaking of sin, and that it involves justification by faith only, which last doctrine is, perhaps, really received in their hearts by many who scruple to confess it in words. Neither is it at all probable that a man who has once advanced thus far in religion will pro-

ceed no farther; if we follow the light, we shall come to the light; and the more earnestly we follow the light, the more gloriously will our light shine.

Our author, as is usual with theorists, overstates the difficulty which he objects to his opponents. "What even is so scarce in the multitude of men as the power of stating any simple matter of fact as they witnessed it?" (P. 176.) If Mr. Newman had been in the habit of attending courts of justice, he would have found that such a power is by no means scarce: on the contrary, there are very few who are unable to state a simple matter of fact as they witnessed it. Discrepances of testimony, where the matter of fact is simple and the witnesses equally honest, are rare. Where the matter of fact is complicated, apparent discrepances of testimony are doubtless frequent, and one reason for this is, that the witnesses who differ, often do so because they see distinct parts of the same transaction.

Mr. Newman's argument is really sceptical, and therefore cannot be fairly used by one who professes himself a believer; it is of little value, for it proves too much; but, such as it is, it may be urged far more strongly against traditionists and irrationalists than against Protestants; for if there are such "interminable confusions and misunderstandings in controversy among the most earnest men,"

it follows that the less we meddle with any religious book besides the Bible, the better, for that alone is inspired, as even Mr. Newman admits, and therefore is the only book which can tell us nothing but truth. However, we do not allow that there are such "interminable confusions and misunderstandings" among those who really love the truth; and it should not be forgotten that love of truth is not always the reason why men are in earnest.

Enough, perhaps, has been said to prove that the right of private judgment is not, as Mr. Newman asserts, "a monopoly" (p. 177.): but "it is one thing to apprehend the Catholic doctrines, quite another to ascertain how and where they are implied in Scripture. Most men of fair education can understand the sacred doctrine debated at Nicea as fully as a professed theologian; but few have minds tutored into patient inquiry, attention, and accuracy sufficient to prove it aright from Scripture. Scripture is not so clear, in God's providential arrangement, to which we submit, as to hinder ordinary persons who read it for themselves from being Sabellians, or Independents, or Wesleyans." (P. 178.) Now we do not maintain that men are to be taught nothing in religion, and as soon as they are old enough, to have a Bible put into their hands, and to make out its meaning for themselves as they can; but that the Bible is the

test whereby it is not only their right but their duty to prove what they are taught. If, by "the sacred doctrine debated at Nicea," be meant the Nicene creed, though it is undoubtedly most clear and express, and, as I think, by far the most valuable of the three Creeds, I cannot admit it to be clearer than Scripture; but an opportunity will hereafter occur of considering this point. "A professed theologian" may yet be "a natural man," and as such incapable of apprehending spiritual truths; for "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned. But he that is spiritual judgeth all things, yet he himself is judged of no man."*

It is true that men differ as to the meaning of Scripture; but do they agree as to the meaning of any book of sufficient importance to render its meaning a matter of much discussion? We believe that Scripture is not less, but, to a great extent, more clear than other books; certain it is that its meaning has been tortured in a manner which men would not have ventured upon in the case of any other book. The Bible is simple enough to be apprehended, as far as is necessary to salvation, by the

* 1 Cor. ii. 14, 15.

meanest intellect, and too comprehensive to be every where fathomed by the mightiest; and men who have a vast opinion of their own intellects would do well to remember that "God resisteth the proud, and giveth grace unto the humble."

As to "orthodoxy, in its fullest range, being the one and only sense of Scripture," although Scripture is doubtless consistent in all its parts, we answer, that absolute orthodoxy does not exist. There are, indeed, and have always been, many who call whatever they think, orthodoxy, and whatever they do not think, heresy; but, since the inspired apostles, there never lived one man, much less one Church, unerring in matters of faith. Who that has thought has never doubted, and how can doubt be compatible with absolute orthodoxy? To think otherwise is only to think meanly of Christian perfection, to think very differently from that great, good, wise, and humble man, who, perhaps, approached absolute orthodoxy as near as any, who yet assuredly will not be held unerring by any of his rational admirers, and who would have been the last to claim an unerring judgment for himself, or he would not have written thus: "Every error in things appertaining unto God is repugnant unto faith; every fearful cogitation, unto hope; unto love, every straggling inordinate desire; unto holiness, every blemish whereby either the inward thoughts of our minds,

or the outward actions of our lives, are stained." * If none think absolutely aright, how can we expect to find absolute agreement among men? Nevertheless, among those who love the truth, there is agreement to a very great extent; for the chief doctrines of Christianity are sufficiently clear, and with this we must be satisfied.

Mr. Newman gives "undervaluing the sacraments," as an instance of departure from orthodoxy; but overvaluing them is a departure likewise; and who is to decide between the parties? Any given Church or congregation may exclude men professing certain opinions, but none can say with absolute certainty what is the truth, since all Churches are alike composed of fallible men. If men are allowed to take their faith from Scripture, our author asks with great simplicity, as if all orthodoxy were concentrated in his own person, "What is to secure their stopping at the very point we wish?" (P. 179.) We ask him, in our turn, what is to secure his being always in the right? Certainly he is not here in the right in putting the scriptural evidence for transubstantiation and that for the divinity of the Holy Spirit on the same level. Our Lord calls the sacramental cup "this fruit of the vine †," after he had called it "my blood:" besides, it is a monstrous

* Hooker, vol. iii. p. 645. ed. 1836.

† Matt. xxvi. 29. I am indebted to Dr. Shuttleworth for this remark.

absurdity to suppose the disciples literally drinking our Lord's blood before it was shed. No man can believe transubstantiation without depriving himself *pro tanto* of the use both of his understanding and his senses. But the Holy Spirit is repeatedly called "the Spirit of God," and how can "the Spirit of God" be less than divine?

We fully agree with Mr. Newman, that prejudices disqualify men from searching Scripture (p. 180.); and we call upon him to admit the converse of the proposition, that men are qualified to search Scripture by the love of truth. We know not that "professed theologians" are freer from prejudice, or love truth better than other men. As to the faith taught by the Church Catholic being "ascertainable as a matter of fact, beyond the influence of prejudice," we take issue with our author on every point. If by the Church Catholic be meant the Church visible, we answer, that the Church visible, of which the Romanists are a large portion, has taught and continues to teach falsehood; that what the Church has taught is not a matter of fact, but a matter of opinion, to be ascertained as we ascertain the sense of Scripture, by the use of our understandings; that what the Church has taught from authority, Mr. Newman cannot tell, since, among our teachers from authority, he does not know whether to include or not all the theological writers

of more than four centuries; that we have no reason for holding any man, or Church, since the apostles, a teacher from authority, and that no man or Church, in any subsequent age of the Church, can be proved to have been either infallible or inspired.

Mr. Newman proceeds to give many instances of what he considers misinterpretations, or contradictory interpretations of Scripture. If he or any other man, from antiquity or any other source, can put forth an infallible interpretation of Scripture, let them do so; in the mean time, without considering any interpretation infallible, we are content to use what helps we have. We are charged with going "by no rule" in interpreting Scripture; the answer is we know of none equally applicable in all cases. If there be such a rule, let those who know it produce it. True it is we interpret Scripture generally by the context, and by comparison with itself; we consider some passages figurative, others literal; we consider some precepts temporary only, and some repealed by subsequent scriptural revelation; and we ask who has ever commented on Scripture without doing as much? Whether, when we say we "go by common sense" we "really go by prejudice" (p. 183.), is more than Mr. Newman or any other man can tell: sufficient for him is his own responsibility. We deny that we can determine when Scripture is figurative, and when it is literal, by

seeing "how the early Church understood it." If so, let Mr. Newman or his friends publish a commentary, extracted from the early writers, and giving a fair outline of their general opinions, not of those only which they held in common with ourselves. Would many modern commentaries suffer much by comparison with the fanciful speculations of Origen, or the argument of Clement of Rome for the truth of the resurrection, or the notions of Justin Martyr on the origin of evil, or of Irenæus on the wonderful fertility of the vines of the Millennium?

When Mr. Newman objects to us that "the Protestant, in his exposition of justification by faith *only*, may be indulged in contradicting St. James, without agreeing with St. Paul" (p. 183.), he is more than commonly unfortunate. "Except," says Hooker, in his invaluable sermon on justification, "there be an ambiguity in some term, St. Paul and St. James do contradict each other; which cannot be." Now it is clear, that St. Paul, by a saving faith does not mean the faith of devils, or belief without trust; it is also clear that St. James does. "Devils know the same things which we believe, and the minds of the most ungodly may be fully persuaded of the truth; which knowledge in the one, and persuasion in the other, is sometimes termed faith, being indeed no such faith as that whereby a Chris-

tian man is justified. It is the Spirit of adoption which worketh faith in us, in them not; the things which we believe, are by us apprehended, not only as true, but also as good, and that to us: as good, they are not by them apprehended; as true, they are. Whereupon followeth a third difference; the Christian man, the more he increaseth in faith, the more his joy and comfort aboundeth: but they, the more sure they are of the truth, the more they quake and tremble at it." And again, — "There are two kinds of Christian righteousness: the one without us, which we have by imputation; the other in us, which consisteth of faith, hope, and charity, and other Christian virtues; and St. James doth prove that Abraham had not only the one, because the thing he believed was imputed unto him for righteousness; but also the other, because he offered up his son. God giveth us both the one justice and the other: the one by accepting us for righteous in Christ; the other by working Christian righteousness in us." *

It is remarkable that, although the doctrine of justification by faith only is not found in any of the three creeds, it is of greater antiquity in the Church, independent of Scripture, than all of them; yet we see those who are loudest in their profession of reverence for antiquity rejecting it.

* Hooker, vol. iii. p. 631—641.

Clement of Rome, in his first, and I believe only epistle which is undoubtedly genuine, writes thus *:—

"And we therefore being called by his will in Christ Jesus, are not justified by ourselves, or by our own wisdom, or knowledge, or piety, or works which we have done in holiness of heart; but by faith, whereby Almighty God hath justified all those elect from the beginning."

Polycarp † also says, in part quoting from the second chapter of Ephesians," — Knowing that by grace ye are saved, not by works, but by the will of God through Jesus Christ."

These passages are surely most clear, yet we cannot admit either of them to be clearer than the

* Καὶ ἡμεις οὖν διὰ θελήματος αὐτοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ κληθέντες, οὐ δι' ἑαυτῶν δικαιούμεθα, οὐδὲ διὰ τῆς ἡμετέρας σοφίας, ἢ συνέσεως, ἢ εὐσεβείας, ἢ ἔργων ὧν κατειργασάμεθα ἐν ὁσιότητι καρδίας· ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς πίστεως, δι' ἧς πάντας τοὺς ἀπ' αἰῶνος ὁ παντοκράτωρ Θεὸς ἐδικαίωσεν. (*s.* 32.)— *Patres Apostolici*, ed. Cotelerius. Amstelædami, 1724. vol. i. p. 166.

Lest some should be induced from this passage to attach too much weight to Clement's authority, it is proper to observe that, in the same epistle, he relates the fable of the Phœnix with undoubting credulity, and uses it as an argument for the truth of the resurrection. (*s.* 25.) Origen, Tertullian, Gregory Nazianzen, Jerome, Ambrose, and other Fathers do the same, according to the annotator on the passage, who himself, in the true spirit of the "errare mallem," believes the fable on their authority.

† Εἰδοτες ὅτι χάριτί ἐστε σεσωσμένοι, οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων, ἀλλὰ θελήματι Θεοῦ, διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. — *Patres Apostolici*, vol. ii. p. 187.

words of St. Paul,—"By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast." *

The words of the Church of England in the eleventh article, are equally clear, — "That we are justified by faith only is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort." If all these passages are not plain, — and many others might be quoted,— we ask those who deny the doctrine, to put it if they can in plainer language; if they cannot, they are bound in honesty to secede from the Church of England, not to eat her bread and betray her principles, to teach doctrines which the Church denounces, in the Church's name. For is it less than treachery to the Church of England to teach as her doctrine that "the sacraments are the immediate, faith is the secondary, subordinate, or representative instrument of justification?" † (*Newman on Justification*, p. 260.) Justification by faith only is not a barren opinion, but an energic principle, and therefore did Luther write it as an undying scroll on the Protestant banner, as the Christian's only triumphant answer to his accusing Foe.

When Mr. Newman says, that "the popular reli-

* Eph. ii. 8.

† The absurdity of this position is evident, for the sacraments are external, and faith is internal. That which is inward cannot represent that which is outward, but that which is outward may represent that which is inward.

gion of the day is a slave to traditions of men, and interprets Scripture in a spirit of caprice," after the specimen we have just had of his mode of interpreting Scripture, the apostolical Fathers, and the Church of England, we could smile, if such gross self-delusion were not rather a subject of pity. That Scripture, interpreted in the spirit we interpret it, "might be made to prove Romanism quite as well" (p. 184.), we deny; if it can, it is open to Mr. Newman to do it. If Romanists can prove their faith from Scripture, why do they add to it?

We do not profess to understand every passage in Scripture; on the contrary, we confess that we are not able to understand many: — who is able to understand all? nevertheless, we feel little difficulty as to the passage in the second chapter of the second epistle to the Thessalonians, with which Mr. Newman presses us, — "Stand fast, and hold the traditions." We conceive St. Paul here to command the Thessalonians to hold fast whatever they had been taught, whether by word or writing; not that any doctrine had been taught them, "too sacred or too subtle to record in words" (p. 249.); a superstitious notion, for which we have no scriptural warrant whatever. We consider that in holding fast what St. Paul wrote, we hold fast also what he preached; that he delivered no more orally than Scripture contains, and that if St. Paul delivered to

the Thessalonians any traditions not contained in Scripture, before we can hold them fast, we must know what they are; a question which Mr. Newman and the Romanists are well aware that they cannot answer. That St. Paul in his preaching held back nothing, we know; for he says in the Acts, xx. 27., "I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God," and therefore does the holy apostle declare himself "pure from the blood of all men," which those ministers who wilfully hold back any thing cannot be.

"Anointing them with oil in the name of the Lord," mentioned by St. James, is a rite or ceremony, and we have already seen that "the Church has power to decree rites and ceremonies," and that all apostolical rites are not observed by Mr. Newman and the Romanists.

As to the Unitarians, whose perversions of Scripture are somewhat insidiously objected to us (p. 185.), it is sufficient to remark, what our author must surely know, that the Unitarians deny the plenary inspiration of Scripture; and as they have no means of determining inspired passages from those which they assume to be uninspired, when pressed by any text, they have only to deny its inspiration, and they are furnished with a ready answer. This instance, therefore, does not prove Mr. Newman's point, "that Scripture does not

teach doctrine as the Athanasian creed teaches it" (p. 187.). Why should not the Unitarians receive the Athanasian creed in the same spirit in which they receive the Bible?

The words, "the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth" (1 Tim. iii. 15.), cannot apply to the visible Church in all ages, because the visible Church, far from being a pillar of truth, has often taught falsehood. Hooker restricts all promises to the mystical Church, as we have already seen. The text would seem to declare what every particular Church ought to be, not what any Church is.

We do not consider that the words, "thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church," apply to St. Peter only, but to all the apostles, for the Church is said, in another passage, to be built "upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone."

Mr. Newman's argument is truly Popish: the same argument and the same texts are urged by the Jesuit Knott, and answered by Chillingworth. To say "that Scripture was never intended to teach doctrine to the many" (p. 189.), is nothing more than a groundless assertion, which our author proceeds to argue upon without any proof, as if it were an axiom. What shadow of an argument is there for restricting the words of St. John, xx. 31., to those

only who are "already instructed in doctrine?" "These are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name."

We approach at length very nearly to infallibility: between infallibility and private judgment there is, in fact, no middle course. "The Church truly may be said almost infallibly to interpret Scripture" (p. 190.): then why is not the almost infallible interpretation produced? Until we have it, we are warranted in retorting upon whatever Mr. Newman means by the Church, which he superstitiously calls "the Prophet of God" (p. 191.), a prophet which can foretell nothing, the same objections which he makes to Protestant commentators. The Church cannot "embrace the whole Bible;" the Church cannot "interpret the whole;" the Church has no "key which will revolve through the entire compass of the wards which lie within;" the Church cannot "solve the great secret and utter the mystery of its pages."

We trust, then, that we have already proved what we are charged with receiving without proof, that under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, "Scripture is the only divine instrument given us; that every thing else is human; that the Church is human; that rites are human; that teachers are human; that the Fathers are but fallible men; that

creeds and confessions, primitive faith, are human systems and doctrines of men" (p. 191.). Sacraments we do not hold to be of human origin, but that "they have a wholesome effect or operation in such only as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive them*;" and "apostolical traditions," as universally imperative upon Christians, we deny to exist.

Mr. Newman, at p. 194., calls upon us to follow the opinion of the multitude. Then we ought to be Papists, for Popery has been professed by a greater number of men than any other Christian sect. Our author would follow the multitude, just as he follows antiquity, that is, as we have seen, as far as suits his convenience. What man of any reflection, or of any information, believes the multitude always right on religion, or on any other subject? "Fallible men may convey truth infallible" (p. 195.). Doubtless, but they may also convey falsehood. We do not derive our religion from fallible men, but from infallible Scripture, which we receive, not from men, but through men. What men have said or written on religion, as on all other moral subjects, we believe to be a mixture of truth and falsehood.

Mr. Newman challenges us to produce a text to establish the point, "that Scripture is the sole necessary instrument of the Holy Ghost for guiding

* Art. XXV. XXVII. XXVIII.

the individual Christian into saving truth" (p. 196.). Here is one (2 Tim. iii. 15.)—"The Holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus." Mr. Newman quotes the next verse as insufficient to establish the point, but omits this which is sufficient; for how can the Scriptures make us "wise unto salvation," if some other teaching must be added? If other means are absolutely required, it follows that the Scriptures are unable. Neither do such texts as, "Ask and it shall be given unto you, seek and ye shall find," prove that "no external means at all is necessary, not even Scripture; for Scripture is not mentioned" (p. 197.). Without Scripture we should not know what to ask. As we have said already, we reject no external means, but we deny the absolute and universal necessity of any means beyond Scripture, the Spirit, and prayer. Of other means we hold the "foolishness of preaching" to be more efficacious than antiquity and catholicity, whatever is meant by those vague words.

Mr. Newman here indulges in a great deal of hypothesis, a most reprehensible mode of insinuating what he dares not assert, and more dangerous than a sneer, which has little effect on men really in earnest.

We do not receive doctrines on tradition, as asserted, p. 198. "Tradition," like "Church," is a

convenient word for controversialists. It may be oral; it may be written; it may mean whatever one man delivers to another. In this last sense only do we receive Scripture on tradition, just as we receive the poems of Horace on tradition. That the Fathers had the same Scriptures with ourselves is a matter of fact; that they held the same doctrines is a matter of opinion, at least as far as the meaning of Scripture is a matter of opinion. If we doubt what Scripture means, so we may doubt with at least as much, nay far greater reason, what the Fathers mean, for the difficulties in interpreting them are infinitely greater than those in interpreting Scripture; as they do not agree among themselves. Besides, the internal evidence for the truth of Scripture is irresistible.

We ask our hypothetical author, does he or does he not mean to refer the text, "Search the Scriptures" to the Jews only? Is this the doctrine of antiquity? It is sufficient to observe, in answer to such reasoning, that whatever God has spoken to men, above all other knowledge it must concern men to know. The passage, 2 Peter, i. 19., cannot refer to the Jews only,—"We have also a more sure word of prophecy, whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place." The apostle adds, "There were false

prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you."

If by "the creed" Mr. Newman means that commonly called the Apostles' Creed, we deny that it contains all doctrine ssufficient for salvation, for it does not contain the atonement. But, for discussing this point, a fitter opportunity will presently arise.

We conclude then, that there is "natural probability," and "supernatural promise, that individuals reading Scripture for themselves,"—and we know of none such who neglect all other means,—will, if they earnestly pray for God's assistance, and really desire to know the truth, be led into a saving knowledge of the true faith of a Christian; and that our author has not produced, and cannot produce, satisfactory evidence or arguments to the contrary.

Mr. Newman proceeds to give instances of the abuse of private judgment. Among errors in matters of fact which "now improperly go by the name of traditions, whereas they *seem* really to have originated in a misunderstanding of Scripture" (p. 203.), he mentions, "the report recorded by Irenæus, that our Saviour lived to be forty or fifty." Now, will Mr. Newman venture not to insinuate, but to assert, that this report of Irenæus did so originate in a misunderstanding of Scripture? and will he furnish us with a test for discriminating

true from false traditions? In the mean time, nothing is easier than to ascribe the origin of any tradition subsequently rejected, to "mis-construction of Scripture." It is remarkable, that two traditions, according to Chillingworth, better attested than any others in the primitive Church, have been both subsequently rejected. These are, that relating to the Millennium, now believed by many, not on the authority of tradition, but because they consider it a scriptural revelation, although it appears to be rejected by Mr. Newman; and the communicating of infants, now rejected alike by both Papists and Protestants. I cannot discover that Mr. Newman has once mentioned this last tradition throughout his work.

It must be observed, that it affects not the validity of the argument, whether these two traditions were held by the primitive Church as traditions only, or as doctrines derived from Scripture. If they were so held as traditions, and it can be shewn that they have all the marks of a genuine tradition, then their subsequent rejection is fatal to the authority of the primitive Church as a witness of traditions; if they were held by the primitive Church as scriptural doctrines, according to the same rule whereby we judge other doctrines to have been so held, then their subsequent rejection

is fatal to the authority of the primitive Church as an interpreter of Scripture.

The marks of a true and catholic tradition or doctrine are thus given by Chillingworth, from Cardinal Perron: first,—

"Whatsoever doctrine is believed and taught by the most eminent Fathers of any age of the Church, and by none of their contemporaries opposed or condemned, that is to be esteemed the catholic doctrine of the Church of those times; but the doctrine of the Millenaries was believed and taught by the most eminent Fathers of the age next after the Apostles, and by none of that age opposed or condemned; therefore it was the catholic doctrine of the Church of those times." (Vol. iii. p. 370.)

He proceeds to give several authorities, and then states the second rule from the same theologian thus, adding as before the consequence (p. 373.):—

"Whatsoever doctrine is taught by the Fathers of any age, not as doctors, but as witnesses of the tradition of the Church, that is, not as their own opinion, but as the doctrine of the Church of their times, that is undoubtedly to be so esteemed, especially if none contradicted them in it; but the Fathers above cited teach this doctrine, not as their own private opinion, but as the Christian tradition, and as the doctrine of the Church, neither did any

contradict them in it; ergo it is undoubtedly to be so esteemed.

"The communicating infants, by the confession of Cardinal Perron, Maldonate, and Binnius, was the custom of the Church for six hundred years at least; it is expressly and in terms vouched by St. Austin for the doctrine of the Church, and an apostolic tradition; it was never instituted by a general council, but in the use of the Church as long before the first general council, as St. Cyprian before that council; there is no known author nor beginning of it; all which are the catholic marks of an apostolic tradition; and yet this you (Romanists) say is not so, or if it be, why have you abolished it? The opinion of the Chiliasts (Millenaries) lineally derives its pedigree from our Saviour to St. John; from St. John to Papias; from Papias to Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Melito Sardensis, Tertullian, and others of the two first ages; who as they generally agree in the affirmation of this doctrine, and are not contradicted by any of their predecessors, so some of them at least speak to the point, not as doctors, but witnesses, and deliver it for the doctrine of the Church and apostolic tradition, and condemn the contrary as heresy. And therefore, if there be any unwritten traditions, these certainly must be admitted first." (Vol. iii. p. 358, 359. 412.)

Is it candid or honest then in Mr. Newman to

class this tradition as to the Millennium among "local rumours about matters of fact?" (p. 203.) The tradition of the Millennium is not a matter of fact, but a doctrine, a subject of which we can know nothing but by revelation.

But this is not the only argument against tradition. St. John says (xx. 30.), "And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book." Now there is not, I believe, one of these many signs or miracles thus wrought, and not recorded in Scripture, preserved by tradition; yet what was more likely to have been so preserved? There are indeed some sayings attributed to our Lord which are preserved, but I think not one on such strong evidence as the tradition of the Millenaries, and that for administering the sacrament to infants.

Mr. Newman gives several instances of erroneous interpretations of Scripture, in default of tradition: it is hardly necessary to consider them all; but as to some of them, and one such we have mentioned already, it is any thing but clear that they are merely misinterpretations of Scripture, and not traditions; but whether one or the other, our point, that the ancient writers were all fallible, and therefore cannot be of authority, is equally proved.

Mr. Newman says of Arianism, that, "when its history is examined, this peculiarity will be found

respecting it, that it appealed only to Scripture, not to catholic tradition" (p. 205.). The inference from this passage is, that Arianism was a pure novelty; but is it not the fact, — and if so why is it concealed, that, before the council of Nice, the synod of seventy or eighty bishops which condemned the heresy of Paul of Samosata, denied that the Son was of one substance with the Father? * This therefore, is not an instance in point. Arianism had something besides Scripture to appeal to.

The opinions of Augustine on predestination are given as an instance of misinterpretation of Scripture, and disregard of tradition, with no better success. It is impossible to separate predestination from election, and election, as we have seen, was the doctrine of Clement of Rome (p. 98.). Besides, in the very passage quoted from Augustine, he refers to Cyprian, Ambrose, and Gregory, as agreeing with himself. Augustine may have been inconsistent in following tradition at one time and disregarding it at another; if so, his inconsistencies are a stumbling-block to traditionists, but nothing to us. It is scarcely necessary to remark that predestination is the doctrine of the seventeenth article of the Church of England, and also of Hooker's noble sermon on "The Certainty and Perpetuity of

* Chillingworth, vol. i. p. xxi.

Faith in the Elect;" beyond the Church of England and Hooker, in this matter, we do not go.

A still less successful instance is the doctrine of purgatory. "I think," says Mr. Newman, "it may be shewn that its existence is owing to the same indulgence of human reason and of private judgment upon Scripture, in default of catholic tradition" (p. 209.). Certain it is, on his own shewing, that passages strongly in favour of purgatory may be found in the Fathers, though not in the most ancient, and that no passage in favour of it is to be found in Scripture; on the contrary, it is not only an addition to Scripture, but against it. The texts quoted by Mr. Newman, as, "The fire shall try every man's work,"—"He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire," are admitted to be obscure, though elucidated by Scripture, as in Jude, 23., —"Others save with fear, pulling them out of the fire," which obviously does not refer to a future state; but does it therefore follow that they are favourable to purgatory? Many interpretations might be given; one of the simplest is the fire of temptation, whereby all Christians are tried. The passage from 1 Cor. iii. 13. shews also the danger of building on any other foundation than Christ. But purgatory is directly contrary to the text, "Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord: Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their

labours." If purgatory were true, they would not rest. Mr. Newman states "the custom of praying for the dead to have been universal," he adds the mischievous words, "and apparently apostolical" (p. 216.), which he well knows he cannot prove; it is clearly an addition to Scripture, and therefore "accursed." If purgatory be not true, there is no meaning in praying for the dead. What Mr. Newman's object may be, he best knows, but what he has here written on the subject of purgatory is certainly calculated to insinuate doubts whether it may not be true.

It is impossible to refute purgatory from the Fathers, when the early custom of praying for the dead, and such passages as the following, quoted by our author, may be urged against us.

"Lactantius says, 'When He judges the just, He shall try them in the fire. Then they whose sins prevail in weight or number, will be tortured in the fire, and burnt in the extremities; but they who are mature in righteousness and ripeness of virtue shall not feel that flame, for they have somewhat of God within them, to repel and throw off the force of it. Such is the power of innocence, that from it that fire recoils without harm, as having received a mission from God to burn the irreligious, to retire from the righteous:'

"And Augustine, 'Such a suffering, too, it is not

incredible, may happen after this life; and it is a fair question, whether it can be settled or not, whether some Christians, according to their love of the perishing goods of this world, attain salvation more slowly or speedily through a certain purgatorial fire?"' (p. 214, 215.)

Where shall we arrive if we follow these "blind guides?"

Another instance of what Mr. Newman calls "an error introduced professedly on grounds of Scripture without the safeguard of catholic tradition, is the doctrine of the pope's universal bishoprick" (p. 217.). This is really a notion too absurd to argue against. Neither the pope or his bishoprick are once mentioned in Scripture. Mr. Newman admits that passages may be alleged from the Fathers in support of the notion of the supremacy of St. Peter over the other apostles. If so, they who rely on the Fathers must "see to that;" we rely on Scripture only, and are prepared to meet the Romanists on the sole ground of Scripture, on this as on every other point; the errors of the Fathers concern not us. It is clear, however, that the notion of the supremacy of St. Peter has nothing to do with the pope's supremacy; the latter is no consequence of the former, although Mr. Newman seems to think it no easy matter to prove whether the pope is

"honorary primate of Christendom," or not. How can an idolater be the honorary primate of Christendom?

The Romanists found their doctrine of the supremacy of St. Peter over the other apostles on the well-known text, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven." (Matt. xvi. 18, 19.) Now we answer to the first part of the text, that the Church is built "upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone;" and to the second, the words of our Lord, a little after, to all the apostles; (Matt. xviii. 18.) "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." We say, therefore, that this famous text cannot refer to St. Peter only, but to all the apostles, and that he is here addressed, not individually, but as the representative of the whole body.

But, again, there is no scriptural ground for claiming a superiority for St. Peter over St. Paul. It was St. Paul who said of himself, that he was "not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles," who "laboured more abundantly than they all." It was St. Paul who "withstood" St. Peter "to the face because he was to be blamed;" who yet alive "was

caught up into paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter."*

Again, St. John was "the disciple whom Jesus loved:" it was St. John to whose care our Lord commended his mother, when expiring on the cross; it was St. John who was favoured with a revelation of the future condition of the Church to the end of the world; and much larger portions of Scripture were written both by St. John and St. Paul than by St. Peter.

We say not this from any desire to exalt St. John or St. Paul above St. Peter, nor do we exalt these three more prominent apostles above the rest; we deny only that we have any scriptural warrant for such supremacy, and we seek not "to be wise above what is written."

Mr. Newman has given six instances of what he terms "the abuse of private judgment in interpreting Scripture;" we have seen that five of them, with at least as much reason, may be termed instances of the use of tradition; and if we grant his remaining instance to be an abuse of private judgment, the notion of Cyprian†, viz. that baptism by

* 2 Cor. xii. 4.

† It is remarkable that Hooker, vol. i. p. 433., states this error to have arisen, not from the abuse of private judgment, but from neglect of the distinction between the mystical and visible Church, the very error of Mr. Newman himself.

heretics is invalid, what has he proved? Who asserts that private judgment is not often abused? What is there which may not be and has not been often abused? We say also, "the practical conclusion is obvious. Let those whom it concerns" beware how they substitute for private judgment, because they dread its abuse, traditions or authority of antiquity, which may carry them they know not where, and countenance they know not what.

CHAP. III.

THE next question is "the indefectibility of the Church Catholic," which, following Mr. Newman, who does not confine himself to one branch of his subject at a time, we have been obliged to consider in part beforehand. The following argument is but a repetition of what has been already advanced. "The Church enforces, on her own responsibility, what is an historical fact, and ascertainable as other facts, and obvious to the intelligence of inquirers as other facts; viz. the doctrine of the apostles; and private judgment has as little exercise here as in any matters of sense or experience. It may as well claim the right of denying that the apostles existed, or that the Bible exists, as that that doctrine existed and exists" (p. 224.). The obvious fallacy here has been noticed already (p. 35.). The answer is, that points of doctrine are not matters of fact, but conclusions of reason; and that it is not a consequence, because we admit the Fathers as witnesses to prove that they had the same Scriptures with ourselves, that therefore we must receive their authority as interpreters of what the Scriptures mean.

The distinction between matter of law and matter of fact, familiar to every lawyer, and one would have supposed to every reflecting man, since it has its foundation in the nature of things, is exactly in point. We will suppose a witness served with the writ termed a "subpœnâ duces tecum," which means, that he is to appear in court with a writing in his custody, and give evidence. How does it follow, that because we admit him as a witness to prove how the writing came into his possession, and that it is in all respects the same writing as when it was first intrusted to him, that therefore we must admit him as an interpreter of the meaning of the writing? The meaning of the writing is matter of law, its genuineness and authenticity are matters of fact. So it is with the Fathers and the Bible. The distinction is so obvious that they who cannot see it must have an inaccurate mind; they who will not, a dishonest one.

The question whether any given doctrine existed at any given period is not the point at issue, it is much more complicated. Doctrines which we know to have existed at certain periods we do not receive. It is quite clear that the Fathers, like ourselves, held true and false opinions, and no practicable test can be given, besides the Bible, whereby we can certainly discriminate their true opinions from their false. Besides, we must have some reason for sub-

mitting ourselves unconditionally on any point to the judgment of men, not one of whom can be proved infallible any more than ourselves. If we so gratuitously abandon the use of our understandings, what security have we that we shall believe the truth? The service of God is "a reasonable service." I cannot forbear here giving the words of Chillingworth, which are so clear that none can mistake them, and so true that none can answer them;

"For my part, I am certain that God hath given us our reason, to discern between truth and falsehood; and he that will not make this use of it, but believes things he knows not why, I say it is by chance that he believes the truth, and not by choice; and that I cannot but fear that God will not accept of 'this sacrifice of fools!'" (Vol. i. p. 238.)

The only semblance of a reason for thus divesting ourselves of our understandings is the assumed necessity for an absolute union of opinion, a self-contradictory assumption of an impossibility: self-contradictory, because the extent of the authority of the Fathers or the Church, or the point where authority may cease, and private judgment may begin, is confessed to be indeterminate; an assumption, because unsupported by argument; and an impossibility, because it is admitted that the minds of men are differently constituted, and therefore, as

the medium through which objects are viewed varies somewhat in every case, the same objects cannot to all appear the same.

When Mr. Newman says the "Church enforces a fact on its own responsibility" (p. 225.), he uses a phrase without meaning. The Church is a collective body, composed of men, each individually responsible for every thought, every word, and every act; and beyond this, responsibility cannot go. There is a constant attempt throughout this book to raise up an unreal abstraction between man and his Maker.

"Not only," says our author, "is the Church Catholic bound to teach the truth, but she is ever divinely guided to teach it;" and again (p. 227.); "Our reception of the Athanasian creed is another proof of our holding the infallibility of the Church, as some of our divines express it, in matters of saving faith." The Athanasian creed will be considered hereafter; but strip this doctrine of indeterminate infallibility of all verbal incumbrances, and it amounts only to this; that as far, and as long, as the Church teaches the truth, she cannot err; which is a truism, applicable not only to the Church, but to every Christian man in every Christian country. To the visible Church no promises are made in Scripture, beyond continuance, or the maintenance of some truths; the "promises of love, mercy, and

blessedness belong to the mystical Church," as we have seen, according to Hooker; but the promises made to individual members of Christ's body are in Scripture many and great. It does not follow, that, because continuance is prophesied of the visible Church, she is therefore "divinely guided;" on the contrary, the visible Church, in every country nominally Christian, is the world, wherein tares and wheat are mingled together; and it is expressly said, that "the Spirit of truth the world cannot receive."

Mr. Newman says that "the Church not only transmits the faith by human means, but has a supernatural gift for that purpose; that doctrine, which is true considered as an historical fact, is true also because she teaches it." (p. 226.) This is plainly a contradiction of the scriptural passage just quoted, unless the visible Church can be distinguished from the world in some other way than by the lives of many of her members. But who will say, after this, that it is unjust to impute Popery to Mr. Newman; what can a Papist require more? All is made to depend upon the Church. That we do not receive doctrines as historical facts, we have seen; also, that we reject many things which the Fathers of old taught, and that we have no sufficient test for ascertaining when they were right and when they were wrong; and if therefore the Church is to be the foundation of Christianity, the practical

result must be, that every man must take his religion from the mouth of his priest, although he can have no security that his priest and the Church agree. Besides, according to this principle, what the Church teaches is true, as well as what the Church taught, because she so taught and teaches; and yet it appears, that what the Church teaches is not true, unless it agrees with what the Church taught; therefore it is not true, because she teaches it, but because she taught it; and the principle is not only too extensive and complicated to be used, but also self-contradictory. It is true that Mr. Newman repudiates many Popish doctrines, but he maintains the principle which leads to them all.

Yet he afterwards says, with what consistency let the reader judge,—"Tradition," that is, what the Church taught, "without Scripture warrant, does not convey to us any article necessary to salvation; it is not a rule distinct and co-ordinate, but subordinate and ministrative" (p. 370.). But the phrase "Scripture warrant," which has a Protestant sound, is reduced to nothing by making the Church the judge of what is "Scripture warrant;" the Protestantism of the book lies on the surface, Popery is at the core.

Mr. Newman, in quoting the 20th article, has given the sentence only which is most favourable to his own views; he has omitted to observe how

studiously that sentence is guarded and qualified: we give the article entire:—

"The Church hath power to decree rites or ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith: and yet it is not lawful for the Church to ordain any thing that is contrary to God's Word written; neither may it so expound one place of Scripture that it be repugnant to another. Wherefore, although the Church be a witness and a keeper of Holy Writ, yet as it ought not to decree any thing against the same; so besides the same ought it not to enforce any thing to be believed for necessity of salvation."

The Church, therefore, can ordain nothing against Scripture; she must so interpret Scripture as to make it consistent with itself; she can require nothing to be believed as necessary to salvation besides Scripture; and whether she does all this, she cannot herself be the judge, for this would be to make her judge in her own cause; and this article, as well as the sixth, would be nugatory, as we have seen; the party required to believe is necessarily the judge, as far as his own salvation is concerned. How much then is the residuum of authority, beyond matters relating to rites and ceremonies, belonging to the Church? When controversies arise among her members, it is obvious that the power of determining them is inherent in the Church, through her duly authorised representatives;

not the power of determining absolutely what is true and what is false, as Mr. Newman contends, for this is contrary to the 21st article, but the power of admitting or rejecting members professing certain opinions. Any Church attempting to extend this power beyond what Scripture warrants, is guilty of schism; and the Church of England, more especially, in such a case, would stand convicted by her own articles.

Mr. Newman admits that the Church "can have no authority in declaring a lie" (p. 227.); then the question of her authority is to be determined by ascertaining whether she ever has declared a lie or not. Now the most solemn declarations of the Church have been made in general councils; and the second Nicene council, A. D. 787, decreed the worship of images, which is a lie. So also the Ante-Nicene synod, which condemned Paul of Samosata, denied that the Son was of one substance with the Father, which was directly contradicted by the council of Nice. Errors, now recognised as such, have been repeatedly declared by the visible Church, not only in modern, but also in ancient times. It is no answer to say that these errors were made by the visible, and not by the Catholic Church; the visible and the Catholic Church must first be distinguished, which cannot be done. The distinction of Hooker between the visible and mystical Church,

the last not outwardly perceptible, is nowhere recognised by Mr. Newman.

The various passages of Scripture * quoted by our author in support of his theory, we refer, with Hooker, to the mystical Church. Chillingworth † has shewn, as is indeed obvious on reading them, that they cannot refer to the visible Church, otherwise some of the most atrocious monsters that ever defiled the earth must be supposed to have been under the direct influence of the Holy Spirit. Mr. Newman's triumph is therefore premature, when he exclaims, "How Protestant sectaries understand these passages, I know not" (p. 229.). It concerns him more to know how Hooker and Chillingworth understood them, whom he will not venture to call sectaries, although we fully admit, that if they are orthodox, it is not easy to see how he can be so likewise.

Mr. Newman, however, feels the difficulty, and his mode of extricating himself from it is most presumptuous.

"So solemn are the promises made to the Church; so ample is the grace pledged to her; so intelligible are the human provisions appointed for their fulfilment, that there surely is no antecedent reason why Almighty God should not have designed to bestow on the Church that perfect purity which the

* 1 Tim. iii. 15. Eph. iv. 11—14. Isa. lix. 21.

† Vol. i. p. 397. *et seq.*

Romanist claims for her. All through the inspired history we have traces of divine intentions mysteriously frustrated" (p. 233.). And again, "God's promises depend on man's co-operation for their fulfilment in detail."

There cannot be a moment's hesitation as to the answer to this wretched trash. "God is not a man, that he should lie; neither the son of man, that he should repent: hath he said, and shall he not do it? or hath he spoken, and shall he not make it good?" (Numb. xxiii. 19.)

But "the parallel of Judaism is a positive argument in favour of such a supposition" (p. 235.). We say, directly against it, the blessings promised to the Jews were made to depend upon their obedience; curses were as clearly made to depend upon their disobedience. (Deut. xxviii. xxxii.) Their disobedience is expressly foretold in the fifteenth and following verses of the last-mentioned chapter. As to the prophecies, "Thy people also shall be all righteous;" "The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid;" we doubt not that they will be fulfilled in their season, when "the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea;" but that day has not yet arrived. "God cannot lie," and therefore it is impossible that any prophecy should be fulfilled otherwise than He in-

tended, or that His intentions should be "frustrated," for He is "the Lord, and there is none else." Did not our Saviour on the cross say, "I thirst, that the Scripture might be fulfilled?"

But the errors of the visible Church are expressly foretold. Thus we read in 2 Thess. ii. 7., "For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way. And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming: even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion that they should believe a lie: that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness. But we are bound to give thanks alway to God for you, brethren beloved of the Lord, because God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth." This passage clearly relates to the visible Church; it foretells that the visible Church would become corrupted; nay, that in part it already was so, during the very lives of the apostles; "for the mystery of

iniquity doth already work;" and it makes a plain distinction between the visible and mystical Church. There is a prophecy also to the same effect in the second epistle of St. Peter, ii.; and what else is the Apocalypse? What then is the consequence, but that the passages alleged by Mr. Newman cannot refer to the visible Church, because, if so, they would contradict other prophecies, and, as it is admitted, be contrary to fact, neither of which conclusions are possible if the Bible is true; the only remaining inference is, that Mr. Newman's interpretation is entirely wrong. How far will blind attachment to a theory carry us?

Mr. Newman contends that the Church has forfeited the promises made to her by want of unity (p. 236.), as if this were her greatest sin. Unity of spirit is indeed insisted upon in Scripture, but not absolute unity of opinion, although we believe that among those who really love the truth, and are content to receive in all humility whatever they find in Scripture because it is God's Word, differences of opinion are small. If, however, men are sincere in desiring Christian unity both of spirit and opinion, the first step towards it is to require nothing of others which God has not required; until they do this, they may honour unity with their lips, but they are far from it in their hearts. Divisions are most clearly foretold in Scripture:—

"Suppose ye that I am come to give peace on earth?" says our Lord; "I tell you nay, but rather division: for from henceforth there shall be five in one house divided, three against two, and two against three." (Luke, xii. 51, 52.)

"Higher measures of truth," says Mr. Newman, "may be attached to a unity of jurisdiction and external order; while the highest of all, amounting to a continual infallibility, were it ever intended, might require the presence of a superhuman charity and peace which has never been witnessed since the time when 'the disciples continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship.'" (p. 240.) Yet St. Paul tells us that he was "in perils among false brethren:" this absolute unity, therefore, if the scriptural passage referred to is to be so interpreted, did not last long.

It is obvious that the notion that "the Church was destined," or may have been destined, to give our author the benefit of his favourite mood, "to an authoritative ministry which has never been realized" (p. 235.), is contrary to the entire analogy of God's dealings with us, and moreover useless, unless the Church, like the apostles, could discern men's hearts; for what can outward uniformity avail without inward obedience? But the words of our Lord are wholly incompatible with the hypothesis—"Be not ye called Rabbi, for one is your

master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren." The drift of this hypothesis is plain: unless you agree with us, you are guilty of schism; if you agree with us, according to our principles you must believe us "almost infallible." In due time would not the "almost" be omitted?

Mr. Newman's notion that schism and the corruption of doctrine were contemporaneous (p. 242.), is another pure hypothesis, entirely unsupported by facts. We know from Scripture that all Christians did not agree in opinion even in the apostolic age; still less have we any ground for supposing that they so agreed in any subsequent age; and it is incumbent on those who make an assertion so preposterous and improbable, to prove, and not to assume the point. But, although our author attaches such important consequences to schism, he contends that he is not bound to assign any period for its commencement. Now as it is clear that the Romanists, when they claim infallibility, are bound to tell us who or what is infallible, and why, so it is obvious that before we can be sure that we are right in attaching such important consequences to schism, we must know when it began. Whether the corruption of doctrine produced schism, or schism the corruption of doctrine, it is not easy to determine; the probability is, that each was alternately cause and effect; but the tacit assumption

that one side was always entirely in the right, and the other entirely in the wrong, is neither warranted by ecclesiastical history or common sense. One party, doubtless, but not always that in authority, in every case approached truth more nearly than the other, but neither can be shewn to have held it absolutely in all respects.

Mr. Newman follows the example of the Romish controversialists in resorting to insidious and sceptical arguments. There is, in truth, a natural connection between superstition and infidelity. Thus, Mr. Newman and the Romanists may both allege, the first for his hypothesis of schism, the second for their assumption of infallibility, that it is as preposterous to object to the one that he cannot tell us when schism began, to the others that they cannot tell us who or what is infallible, "as it would be to object to the received interpretations" of the prophecies of Jeremiah and Daniel, because difficulties attend their adjustment in detail. (p. 243.) The allegation in either case is nothing to the purpose. The prophecies are fulfilled as God intended that they should be fulfilled; for "with the Father of lights is no variableness, neither shadow of turning." Before Mr. Newman, the Romanists, and Infidels, for in this instance these last will be ready allies, can reasonably object to us what they consider an inadequate fulfilment of any prophecy,

they must shew how God intended it to be fulfilled. There is no necessity that any prophecy should be fulfilled precisely as they please.

The remainder of the argument in this lecture, has been already considered (*antè*, p. 51.). As to the assertion, that "century after century the Church Catholic has become more and more disunited, discordant, and corrupt" (p. 249.), we answer that the Church was far more corrupt in the eleventh and twelfth centuries than at present; and that such unity as then existed, which, however, through the divine grace, was not absolute, was a unity in the belief of many most vile and pernicious falsehoods. There was indeed a time, when, to use the words of one of the most learned writers of our own or of any age, "Popery and Monkery had well-nigh extinguished Christianity."*

We deny also that "unbroken succession is pledged to the ministry of the Church." We deny that any such pledge can be produced, or any such fact as "unbroken succession" proved in any one instance (*antè*, p. 15.). What does Mr. Newman mean by "that creed which St. Paul committed to Timothy"? (p. 249.) He well knows, that what is now called the Apostles' Creed is not mentioned by any writer for centuries afterwards, yet the insinuation is, that the Creed was committed to

* The Doctor, vol. iv.

Timothy. St. Paul committed to Timothy what he committed to all those to whom he preached, viz. the Gospel of Christ: we have not the slightest warrant for assuming that he committed any thing more. "The form of sound words" is contained in the Bible, and there only. As to the "rich but unsorted and uncatalogued treasures," whose existence is insinuated, as usual, under the protection of an hypothesis, where are they?—when did they exist?—how were they lost?—how do we know that they ever existed at all?

It is true that the visible Church, in the worst of times, has never wholly departed from the profession of Christianity; yet the false doctrines mixed up with the true have too often been made the more prominent, and the true so held back or neglected as to be little more than an empty profession. What will it avail men charged with having received themselves, and imposed upon others what they knew or might have known to be false, to answer, that together with the falsehood they held some truths? Some mixture of truth is necessary to enable any falsehood to succeed. Infallibility is not promised to the Church, because continuance is; it is contradicted by facts in every page of ecclesiastical history; it cannot be proved by the Church itself, for this would be to argue in a circle, I am infallible because I am infallible; and

extrinsic proofs there are none. The notion, therefore, of Mr. Newman and the Romanists, "that the Church Catholic," which he cannot distinguish from the Church visible, "is unerring in its declarations of faith, or saving doctrine" (p. 252.), is a "vain deceit," based upon the truism, that as far and as long as the Church holds the truth she cannot err, equally applicable to any man who holds any truth.

We see then what Mr. Newman means by indefectibility, and where he arrives at last.

Mr. Newman asks himself the question, "What doctrines the Church Catholic will teach indefectibly;" and the answer he gives is, that the "essential doctrines are those which are contained in the Creed." (p. 259.) This is the most favourable ground he can take whereupon to build his indefectible abstraction the Church, because it would be difficult to shew that any doctrines have been more constantly taught in the visible Church than those contained in the Creed; but what becomes of the indefectibility of the visible Church, if it shall appear that the Creed does not contain what is absolutely necessary to salvation?

We maintain that there has always existed on earth not only a visible, but also a mystical Church; and that the members of that Church, though not absolutely united in opinion, have always taught what is essential to salvation. We deny that the

visible Church has always taught saving truth, although we admit that her doctrines, and indeed, in some degree, those of all religions, however corrupt and fabulous, have ever contained some mixture of truth with falsehood.

"It is known," says Mr. Newman, "to all who are acquainted with Christian antiquity, that at baptism the candidate made a confession of his faith, before he was admissible to it. Here, then, we have one of our inquiries answered at once. Whatever that confession might contain, it was, by the force of the terms, the primitive condition of communion, or fundamental faith." (p. 260.) So far we agree with Mr. Newman, excepting that it is quite unnecessary to go beyond Scripture for the fact that a confession of faith was made before baptism by the primitive Christians. He says, — "This confession was what we now call the Creed." We say, it was the doctrine of the atonement, which is not contained in the Creed. There is no conversion mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles, from which this is not the legitimate inference, but more especially from the detailed narrative of the conversion of the eunuch by Philip, in the eighth chapter. It appears that Philip found the eunuch reading the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah; of all the prophecies in the Old Testament the most precise and remarkable, and where the doctrine of the atonement is declared in

the most positive terms: — "But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed." When, therefore, we read in the Acts, that Philip "began at the same Scripture, and preached unto him Jesus," there can be no doubt that what he preached was the atonement; as it appears also from what follows: "And the eunuch said, See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." A barren assent of the understanding was not sufficient, he was required to believe with all his heart; that is, to trust,— and in what could he trust but in the atonement of Christ?

But, it may be said, the words of the Creed, "I believe in Jesus Christ," on the same principle, imply the atonement. They may certainly, but they need not; the more natural conclusion is the contrary one. In the scriptural narratives of conversions, we have not an account of all that passed, but the simple confessions of faith have a profound meaning. Besides, the Bible is a whole in itself, and we are always at liberty to call in the assistance of one passage to elucidate another: but the Creed also professes to be a whole; and what is its value if it leaves the most important doctrine of Chris-

tianity, at the best, to be obscurely and doubtfully inferred from it? and that, too, when a single sentence would have removed all doubt, such as the one we find in the Nicene Creed,—"Who for us men, and for our salvation, came down from heaven .... and was crucified also for us!" It is true that in another part of the Creed it is said, "I believe in the forgiveness of sins;" but this rather strengthens the argument for the omission of the atonement, because "the forgiveness of sins." is in no way connected with Christ.

Again, the Creed requires belief in "the communion of saints," confessedly an obscure expression, which may have many meanings; and whatever its meaning may be, we are quite unable to ascertain it from the Creed itself, which is therefore not a whole.

Many have been taught to feel a reverence for the pseudo-apostolic Creed, to which it is wholly unentitled; we say pseudo-apostolic, because there is not a shadow of proof that it was written by the apostles; and the first author who mentions it by name is Ruffinus*, about the end of the fourth

* Tomline (Theology, vol. ii. p. 225, 226.) says, "The primitive fathers often speak of an *apostolical creed:* but by that name they do not mean a determinate form of words drawn up by the apostles, but a creed containing the doctrines which they preached; and this is what we are to understand by the creed, *commonly called the Apostles' Creed.*"

century. What can be the value of a belief in the communion of saints, without holding justification by faith only,—a doctrine which, if antiquity be of any weight, has claims inferior to none, since it was maintained, as we have seen, by Clement of Rome, the contemporary of the apostles!

We blame not the so-called Apostles' Creed for its contents—for we receive all that it contains—but for its deficiencies, which, there is great reason to fear, have been a snare and a stumbling-block to many.

Mr. Newman proceeds: "At first, indeed, that is, during the first years of the apostles, while the Church itself was forming, the Creed was but partially developed too; nor, indeed, was there any imperative necessity that any part of the system should be reduced to rule, while infallible guides were present." This hypothesis of a partial development of the creed or faith of a Christian, at first, is directly at variance with Scripture; for St. Paul says, "I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God." The true and entire faith was clearly preached from the very first; the controversy as to circumcision related to a rite or ceremony, not to a matter of faith. It will be observed that Mr. Newman so uses the word creed here, as to leave it doubtful whether he means the faith of a Christian, or the so-called Apostles' Creed.

There is also an attempt to insinuate that Christianity was a gradually perfected system, which is the Popish view of it, although scarcely compatible with the extravagant respect professed for antiquity. We come to a more insidious passage: "This elementary confession," viz. such as that of the eunuch, "thus brief and incomplete as far as the express words went, seems, even before the apostles' death, to have been expanded and moulded into form; and in that form it has remained up to this day in the baptismal service. I say this was done in the apostles' days, because history bears witness to the fact, calling it 'The Creed,' 'The Apostles' Creed,' the treasure and legacy of faith which the apostles had left to their converts, and which was to be preserved in the Church to the end. Indeed, St. Paul, in his first epistle to the Corinthians, so speaks of it, when quoting part of it, viz. as that which had been committed to him, and which he had committed in turn to his converts." (p. 261.)

The word creed means belief; and availing himself of this circumstance, Mr. Newman has so used it throughout this passage, that it may mean either "the Creed," or the faith of a Christian. This is the familiar fallacy of a doubtful middle term, which it is hard to believe that Mr. Newman was not aware of when he used it. He begins with an insinuation in his usual manner; this confession

seems to have been expanded into form before the apostles' death; he ends with an assertion that St. Paul quotes it. If St. Paul does quote it, it must have been expanded into form before the apostles' death, and the seeming is raised to certainty. Whether St. Paul does so quote it, let the reader judge: the passage referred to is 1 Cor. xv. 3. —"For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures." Now the words "died for our sins," which are surely of no little importance, since they include the doctrine of the atonement, are not to be found in "the Creed;" how then can St. Paul be said to quote it?

But this is not all. St. Paul delivered only what he first received, and that not from man but from God, for St. Paul was not converted through the agency of man. It follows, then, that if St. Paul here alludes to the so-called Apostles' Creed, he must have received it from God himself, a conclusion which even Mr. Newman will shrink from. He well knows that what St. Paul here alludes to is the true Christian faith, not necessary to be always expressed in the same determinate form of words, but in substance, like its author and finisher, Jesus Christ, "the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever."

How is it possible in this instance to acquit Mr.

Newman of a deliberate intention to deceive! He stands convicted out of his own mouth, for he himself quotes the creeds of Irenæus and Tertullian, which differ both from each other, and from the so-called Apostles' Creed; a sufficient proof that a determinate form of words, as an apostolic "legacy of faith," did not exist in their days; for if it had, it would of course have been generally adopted. It is not the so-called Apostles' Creed which Irenæus, Tertullian, and others cite, but a creed, a portion of the articles of the Christian faith; and the distinction is important when a superstitious value is sought to be attached to "the Creed." According to Mr. Newman's argument, nearly half the New Testament might be called a quotation from the Creed, with just as much reason as the text in the first Corinthians. Yet he admits that "the words of the Creed were not inspired." (p. 269.) He quotes also the following passage from Cyril of Jerusalem, which it is not easy to reconcile with his own notions of the authority of tradition, antiquity, or the Creed. "'As regards the divine and holy mysteries of faith, it is necessary that not even a chance word should be delivered in our tradition, without the warrant of divine Scripture, to the exclusion of mere probabilities, or skilfully contrived arguments. Neither give credence to my mere words, unless they are

demonstrated from the Scriptures. For this is the saving principle of our faith, being derived, not from our inventions, but from proofs of Holy Scriptures. What makes this passage the stronger, is, that Cyril speaks thus with reference to the Creed, which, if any statement of doctrine, might surely depend on tradition." (p. 378.)

The creed, or rather creeds of the early Church, were not then, as Mr. Newman asserts, "one and the same every where" (p. 265.); even verbal variations are sufficient to refute this position. But the variations in these creeds were substantial, and not merely verbal, as appears from Mr. Newman himself. Thus the Creed of Irenæus contains the words "incarnate for our salvation," which the so-called Apostles' Creed does not. The African Creed speaks of "forgiveness of sins through the Holy Church," which Mr. Newman quotes and approves of (p. 276.), apparently without a suspicion of its orthodoxy, although it is the very heresy called "accursed" in the eighteenth article of the Church of England. "They also are to be had accursed, that presume to say, that every man shall be saved by the law or sect which he professeth; so that he be diligent to frame his life according to that law, and the light of nature. For Holy Scripture doth set out unto us only the name of Jesus Christ, whereby men must be saved." Again, the

Creed of Tertullian differs from that of Irenæus, the Nicene, the pseudo-apostolic, and the pseudo-Athanasian creeds, in declaring the appearances of God recorded in the Old Testament, to have been those of the second person in the Trinity.

Mr. Newman is himself compelled to admit that the word Homoousion, or co-essential, in the Nicene Creed, is an addition to the pseudo-apostolic (p. 271, 272.) But how can this be called the only addition? Is not the atonement an addition? Is not the joint procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son, an addition? Is not the creation of all things by Jesus Christ, an addition? And, lastly, is not "the communion of saints" omitted? Not that we would insinuate for a moment that any thing in the Nicene Creed is a substantial addition to Scripture; on the contrary, we believe it to be the most scriptural, and therefore the most valuable, of all the creeds; but additions to Scripture, and additions to the so-called Apostles' Creed, are very different matters.

Having assumed that the language of Scripture and of the Fathers refers, not to a creed or the faith of a Christian, but to "the Creed," Mr. Newman, to extricate himself from the labyrinth of difficulties in which such an assumption involves him, is driven to the argument *à priori*, that doctrines, "such as the divinity of the Holy Ghost, must

have been implied and virtually contained in the Creed, if the Creed had any title to the name of a symbol, or rule, or summary of Christian doctrine" (p. 265.). The very point to be proved is, that "the Creed" is such a rule or summary. A summary of the leading doctrines of Christianity, if it is intended to be of use, must contain those leading doctrines clearly and explicitly: if it contains some of the chief Christian doctrines implicitly only, it ceases to be a rule or summary, by the very force of the terms. Now "the Creed" does not contain the doctrine of the atonement clearly and explicitly; but the doctrine of the atonement is the very foundation of Christianity, therefore "the Creed" cannot be such a rule or summary.

When Mr. Newman speaks of the Creed as "the formal symbol which the apostles adopted and bequeathed to the Church" (p. 270.), we call upon him to prove his words. How does he know that the apostles adopted it? when did they adopt it? and to whom did they bequeath it? Until he has answered these questions, he might as well say at once that the apostles adopted the creed of Pope Pius.

Mr. Newman admits, that after the adoption of the Nicene Creed, "new heresies as to our Lord's nature arose; but in spite of them, Athanasius, its illustrious champion, was firm against the attempt, which was made by some parties, to add further explanations to the Creed" (p. 272.). Is it not then

glaring dishonesty to call by the name of Athanasius a creed which is known not have been in existence until long after his death, and to which on principle he was opposed? The assertion, that from the time of the fourth General Council there was no "interference with the Creed till the era of the Council of Trent," is directly contrary to the fact: the introduction of the pseudo-Athanasian Creed into the Church, about the year 930*, was such an interference, and also contrary to the decree of the third General Council, quoted by Mr. Newman, "that it should not be lawful for any to publish or compose another faith or creed than that which was defined by the Nicene Council" (p. 274.).

It is for Mr. Newman to reconcile the introduction of the pseudo-Athanasian Creed with his own position, that "to guard and transmit, not to remodel the rule of faith, is the sole duty of the Church" (p. 267.). Protestants, who admit no creed to be binding unless scriptural, are in no such difficulty. Their conclusion is the legitimate one from his own language, "the words of the Creed were not inspired," and from the passage he has himself quoted from Cyril of Jerusalem, which in substance agrees entirely with the sixth article of the Church of England.

* Mant's Prayer Book.

It is sufficient here to shew that Mr. Newman's view of the creeds is untenable; it is fairer, however, and more favourable to the elucidation of truth, to add our own. The position, then, we maintain as to the three creeds is this, that the so-called Apostles' Creed falls short of Scripture; that the Nicene Creed may be proved from Scripture; and that the so-called Athanasian Creed goes beyond Scripture. Of the so-called Apostles' Creed enough has been said; that the Nicene Creed is scriptural is not disputed by Mr. Newman, and therefore a point not necessary here to discuss, we deny only that we have any warrant for assuming the Nicene or any other creed, or any book but the Bible, to contain all essential doctrines: the remaining point is, that the Athanasian Creed is unscriptural.

The eighth article of the Church of England, relating to the creeds, is in the following words:—

"The three creeds, Nice Creed, Athanasius's Creed, and that which is commonly called the Apostles' Creed, ought thoroughly to be received and believed: for they may be proved by most certain warrants of holy Scripture." The reason why they are to be received is, because they can be proved from Scripture; the Church of England recognises no other ground for the reception of any doctrine, as we know from the sixth and twentieth articles. The question then is, whether the so-

called Athanasian Creed can be proved from Scripture, or not? That creed begins thus:—"Whosoever will be saved: before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic faith. Which faith, except every one do keep whole and undefiled: without doubt he shall perish everlastingly." Among the doctrines of the faith which are to be thus kept whole and undefiled is the following:—"The Holy Ghost is of the Father, and of the Son: neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding." Now it is well known that the Greek Church denies the joint procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son; the Greek Church therefore does not keep the Catholic faith whole and undefiled; and, according to this creed, all its members will, without doubt, perish everlastingly. Now we do say, although we believe the joint procession of the Holy Ghost to be scriptural, that we have no scriptural warrant whatever for making salvation impossible to all those who deny it; and, if no scriptural warrant can be produced for it, the maintenance of such a creed is clearly schismatical. The supporters of this creed are guilty of the very sin objected by Mr. Newman to the Romanists; they have "cursed those whom God has not cursed." What possible warrant can men have for annexing damnatory clauses to creeds at all? In so doing they invade the province of God, to

whom alone it belongs to judge. It is to be observed, that this arrogant and presumptuous creed omits justification by faith altogether, and barely mentions the atonement. That it should have been sanctioned by the Church of England has been regretted by many.

Whether the visible Church is justified in adopting from time to time additions, or, as Mr. Newman mildly calls them, explanations, of the creed or faith of a Christian, is a difficult question. If we concede that the Church, or a body of uninspired men, was justified in the first instance in introducing as a creed a determinate form of words not to be found in Scripture, although scriptural in substance, it is hard to contend that the Church or men might not explain or add to what the Church or men originally composed. Certain it is that a most dangerous principle, the germ of innumerable heresies and corruptions, was admitted, when the plain words of Scripture were rejected, as not clear enough to form a creed. Every true Protestant will deny the assumption. Whether the words of Scripture on the leading doctrines of Christianity are not as clear as any that language affords, is a matter which will unquestionably admit of argument. But we are not concerned to prove so much. Let our opponents, the Unitarians and Papists, put the doctrines, for instance, of the

atonement, and of justification by faith only, in the most precise and positive terms they can devise, we will give the same doctrines in scriptural words; and even if they can then shew that their words are more plain and certain than those of the Bible, they will not prove enough; to justify themselves, they must shew that the language of the Bible is less certain than what they are in the constant habit of acting upon in the daily affairs of life. If they cannot do this, to talk of reverence for the Bible is, in the phrase of Chillingworth, "nothing else but talk." The supposed uncertainty of the Bible is not the cause of heresy.

Mr. Newman would have us esteem "the Creed" "almost sacred, from being the chief remains left us of apostolical truth" (p. 277.). As we have seen, there is no proof that it is apostolical; and the assumption on which he would have us ground our superstitious reverence for it, "that the living power of truth has declined," is an assumption, and nothing more, incompatible with ecclesiastical history, and with the last lecture "On the Fortunes of the Church," in his own book.

The Church of England is justifiable in imposing articles of religion upon her members, on precisely the same ground on which the early Church was justifiable in imposing a creed not expressed in scriptural words. It may be questioned whether

either can be justified, but both must stand or fall together. Mr. Newman eludes the difficulty thus:—"The thirty-nine Articles are 'articles of religion,' not 'of faith.' We do not consider the belief in them necessary to salvation, except so far as they embody in them the articles of the Creed" (p. 278.). This is, in the words of Chillingworth, "an empty, unintelligible, nonsense distinction." Mr. Newman cannot contend, without contradicting himself, that the Nicene and so-called Apostles' Creed each contains all that is essential to salvation, or that all contained in each is equally essential; because the one contains what the other does not, as "the communion of saints," for instance; and if he agrees with his own quotation from Cyril of Jerusalem, neither contains what is essential, unless it can be proved from Scripture so to be; and the same thing, neither more or less, may be said for the Articles of the Church of England.

As to "the power of the keys" (p. 280.), let Mr. Newman define it. If by this expression he means that any one man, or body of men, has the power of excluding a fellow-creature from heaven, it has been already considered; at all events, it is not to be found in "the Creed."

When Mr. Newman talks of doctrines lying "hid in the Creed," he has conceded the point at issue, viz. that the Creed is not clearer than the Bible;

and, indeed, granted more than we require—for we do not interpret the Bible, nor should we be justified in interpreting it, by indeterminate implication, whereby any meaning may be given to any form of words: our best mode of interpreting the Bible is by comparing it with itself; but no light can be thrown on the Creed by so interpreting it.

The insinuation (p. 281.), that the Articles of our Church "are partially drawn from traditionary sources," is of the same dishonest character with many other passages in this book already noticed. The authority of tradition is nowhere recognised in the Articles; on the contrary, in the thirty-fourth article it is said, "It is not necessary that traditions and ceremonies be in all places one, or utterly like; for at all times they have been divers, and may be changed." The article proceeds to declare that traditions and ceremonies "not repugnant to the Word of God" should not be broken by private individuals; and what man who has any regard for order would desire that they should? Some ceremonies every Church must have.

Mr. Newman would perhaps give the reception of infant baptism as an acknowledgment of the authority of tradition; but our Church receives it on no such ground, but because it is "most agreeable with the institution of Christ." The time of baptism is not expressly appointed in Scripture, as that

of circumcision was; it is clearly, therefore, a matter within the province of the Church. If infant baptism had been received on the authority of tradition, it would not have been consistent to reject infant communion, which is supported, as we have seen, by the highest traditional authority.

His assertion, that "we do not receive the Articles from individuals but as recommended to us by our Church itself" (p. 281.), is wholly unmeaning. The Articles were drawn up by individuals, and the Church consists of individuals; therefore, take it either way, from individuals we must receive them. The Articles must be either human or divine; they cannot be something between both. A man may profess extravagant reverence for the Articles, and yet contradict them in the most direct and positive manner, as we have seen in Mr. Newman's own case. His views of justification are directly at variance with the eleventh article, and with the Homilies of the Church of England.

As to the words of our author (p. 281, 282.), the Church "intends us to receive them,"—the Articles,—"as portions of Catholic teaching, as expressing and representing that ancient religion which of old time found voice, and attained consistency in Athanasius, Basil, Augustine, Chrysostom, and other primitive doctors;" we ask him, how the Church can speak otherwise than by the mouths of her

members; and how he can know her intentions—the intentions of an abstraction—better than other men? The intentions of the body of men who formed the Church of England can only be inferred from what they have collectively and authoritatively said; and we consider that they have nowhere spoken so authoritatively, consistently, and scripturally, as in the Articles; but their authority was human only, not divine. We cannot admit the canon of 1571, or any other canon, to be of equal authority with the Articles on matters of doctrine. If the Canons merely agree with the Articles, we do not want them; if they add to the Articles on matters of doctrine, why were such additions excluded from the Articles? It is obvious that, as terms of communion, the Articles must be considered amply sufficient, otherwise they are useless; if they are not "necessary for communion," what is?

But the canon of 1571, as quoted by himself, will avail Mr. Newman but little. It enjoins, that preachers "should be careful that they never teach aught in a sermon, to be religiously held and believed by the people, except that which is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old and New Testament, and which the Catholic fathers and ancient bishops have collected from that very doctrine." The object of this canon appears to be to guard against novelties, although, when we consider that Christianity had then

lasted more than 1500 years, and that, during that period, all the energies of minds of every order and character had been devoted to the study and contemplation of religion and of the Bible, it is difficult to see how any thing new could remain to be said. If, however, it is contended that the writings of "the Catholic fathers and ancient bishops" are to be taken as a test of truth jointly with the Bible, we must first know why we are to take them as such a test; a point which cannot be proved by their own words;—we must know who they are, determine their number, and know why it is to be so determined; and lastly, we must be certain that they agree, both with Scripture and among themselves, which we know not to be uniformly the case. Neither can any man call upon others, in all respects, to follow the authority of antiquity, without first doing so himself; and this no man now does, — certainly not the Articles of the Church of England.

"The Protestantism of the day," says Mr. Newman (p. 284.), "considers it a hardship to have any thing clearly and distinctly told it in elucidation of Scripture doctrine, an infringement on its right of doubting, and mistaking, and labouring in vain. And the violent effort to keep itself in this state of ignorance, — 'this unnatural stopping of its ears,' and 'throwing dust into the air,' after the pattern of those Jews who would not hear the voice of

apostles and martyrs, — all this it dignifies by the title of defending the sacred right of private judgment; calls it a holy cause, a righteous battle, and other large and senseless epithets."

An entire mis-statement of the point at issue, and a consequent misrepresentation of the opinions of opponents, is a common artifice of sophists, as, by arguing against the assumed opinion as if it were the real one, they succeed in obtaining a temporary advantage; but, like all other artifices, it generally recoils in the end on those who have resorted to it.

As Protestants, we are willing to receive any thing from any man in elucidation of Scripture, but we will receive nothing as of authority from any man, for these reasons, — *first*, because we have no warrant for so doing: *secondly*, because Scripture has itself expressly forbidden all additions to Scripture, as we have seen; and if we consent to receive the words of men as of authority, we do so add to Scripture, and raise human words to an equality with divine: *thirdly*, because the words of men are contradictory; and if we once consent to receive them as of authority, we cannot tell where to stop, and involve ourselves in endless difficulties. In one word, if we abandon the exercise of our understandings, we have no security that we shall believe the truth.

Mr. Newman proceeds, — "We do boast and

exult in bearing Christ's yoke, whether of faith or of obedience; and we consider his creed, not as a tyrannical infliction (God forbid!), or a jealous test, but as a glorious privilege." To the yoke of Christ we do indeed submit ourselves: if we have advanced any thing repugnant thereunto, let such repugnance be proved, and we will abjure it at once; but we will not submit ourselves, without a reason, to the capricious yoke of the Fathers, to the yoke of superstitious, credulous, inconsistent, and injudicious men. If "the Creed," or any creed, can be proved to be scriptural, we will receive it; if not, we will reject it: we put the matter entirely on that issue. If the Creed were, as Mr. Newman asserts, Christ's creed, it would be inspired; but he has himself denied its inspiration: besides, as far as I know, it never was maintained by any man, that our Lord himself was the author of "the Creed;" Mr. Newman's language, therefore, is either very loose and inaccurate, or very dishonest.

Our "low, carnal, and despicable license to reject" the Creed, amounts only to this; that we do not attribute a mysterious value to any creed or ordinance without scriptural warrant. That Mr. Newman does attribute a superstitious value to the Creed, is plain from his own words; after maintaining that it is the prerogative of every Christian to defend the Creed, he adds, — "All that

learning has to do for him is to ascertain the fact, what is the meaning of the Creed in particular points, since matter of opinion it is not" (p. 285.). Here is again the same confusion of matter of fact with matter of law, already noticed; and we say also, that this view of the Creed is superstitious, because Mr. Newman would have us interpret the Creed, which is not inspired, just as he would have us interpret the Bible, which is. But to what purpose is it to tell a man that he has a right to maintain and defend the Creed, when he must not ascertain its meaning for himself! This is keeping a promise to the ear, and breaking it to the sense. It is not, in fact, the Creed which he has a right to maintain for himself, but the ancient interpretation of it. But an unlearned man cannot ascertain this for himself; all, therefore, that he is really permitted to do, is, to defend the modern construction of the ancient interpretation of the Creed. But this is not all. The words modern and ancient are very vague: if an unlearned person asks who are the moderns, and who are the ancients; he will find some difficulty in getting a satisfactory answer. Besides, he may discover, without any learning, that the moderns differ among themselves; and a very little learning will enable him to discover, even if not suggested to him by a very little reflection, that the ancients differed likewise. What, then, is

the unlearned person to do? The practical result is clear. If he be of a weak and superstitious character, he will believe whatever his priest, or some person on whose judgment he relies, tells him; if he possesses love of truth and courage, he will compare what he hears with the Bible; if indifferent to truth, he will not trouble himself about the matter at all.

It is certainly "not true that the mass of serious Christians derive their faith for themselves from the Scriptures" (p. 290.). They are taught it as children, but this is not, properly speaking, deriving it "from tradition," a very ambiguous word; and if they are in earnest about the matter, they will verify their faith for themselves, when they are able, by the Scriptures. The same remark applies in the case of heathen converts. That the "Church Catholic has ever furnished" true tradition, we entirely deny; we know that the Church visible, which cannot be distinguished from the Catholic, has taught gross falsehoods for centuries together.

Mr. Newman speaks of the notion as most extravagant, "that belief in the Bible is the *sole* or *main* condition for a man being considered a Christian!" (p. 291.) But I know not who maintains it, as he appears to understand it; that is, a belief in the Bible, without believing what it contains. People who do not believe doctrines clearly contained in the Bible, do not believe the Bible, let

them profess what they will. Mr. Newman seems to look upon the Bible as if it had no meaning at all, or might be made to mean any thing. We deny that the Nicene Creed is more certain than the Bible, the so-called Apostles' Creed we maintain to be less so. Men differ, doubtless, as to the meaning of the Bible, and no creeds or formularies can be devised, which will exclude all difference, whether any can be devised more certain than the Bible is very questionable: we maintain that men, equally anxious to receive the truth, whatever it is, differ but little as to their opinion of what the Bible means. How does it follow, that if we maintain the famous principle, that "the Bible only is the religion of Protestants," we cannot at the same time "hold definite essentials of faith?" Does not Mr. Newman himself say, that "words have a meaning in spite of sophistry?" and do they cease to have a meaning, because they are used in the Bible? But it may be said, the Bible is a book of considerable extent, and all men, nay, all true Christians, cannot have an equal knowledge of it; there must then be some essential doctrine, which, at the least, all true Christians must believe as absolutely necessary to salvation. Now, there is an analogy between the Bible and the physical world in this, that as in the physical world nothing created has an absolutely independent, self-sufficient existence, so

that it can be completely separated without destruction from all around it, so also in the Bible there is no absolutely independent doctrine, capable of being torn up, as it were, without discovering both vigorous roots and delicate fibres, connecting it with many other doctrines, whereby the whole is perceived to be one compact and intertangled mass. For instance, we believe the doctrine of the atonement to be truly essential; that no man who denies it has any title even to the name of a Christian; yet it necessarily involves the divinity of Christ; for an angel, the only intermediate class of pure beings, we read of in Scripture, between God and man, could not atone for sin, because it is written, "He chargeth his angels with folly," and because they are inferior to Christ, for, "when he bringeth in the first begotten into the world, he saith, and let all the angels of God worship him;" and worship we know to be due to God alone. Again, the doctrine of justification by faith only is no more than the personal application of the atonement to every man who receives it with all his heart.

When it is said that texts such as that just quoted "*may* imply the Catholic doctrine, yet they *need* not," we answer that the same objection may be made to the Creed, to the Fathers, to any form of words in which the Catholic doctrine can be ex-

pressed. Thus the word Homoousion, of one substance, or rather of one essence, used in the Nicene Creed to express the unity of the Father and the Son, is, it will be admitted, as strong as any which language affords, yet what is it but a verbal variation of the language of our Lord*, "Before Abraham was, I AM!" It is to be observed, that however Unitarians, or other sceptics, may affect at the present day to doubt the meaning of these words, the Jews who heard them had no doubt whatever, for "then took they up stones to cast at him," which was the punishment of blasphemy by their law; they must therefore have agreed with us in understanding our Lord to refer to that most solemn declaration of God in the third chapter of Exodus: "And Moses said unto God, Behold, when I come unto the children of Israel, and shall say unto them, The God of your fathers hath sent me unto you; and they shall say to me, What is his name? what shall I say unto them? And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM; and he said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children, I AM hath sent me unto you." The conclusion is irresistible, that the I AM of the New Testament is the same one and eternal God, of the same essence or being with the I AM of the Old. Strong as it is, we cannot admit the word Homoousion to be stronger or more positive

* John viii. 58.

than those used by our Lord, or that there is any reason why men, who profess to be unconvinced by them, should have been necessarily convinced by the word Homoousion, if it had been found in Scripture.

"Our Articles," it is said, "undeniably contain doctrines not developed out of the Creed, but added to it" (p. 294.). The Articles of the Church of England are not Mr. Newman's articles, for he repeatedly contradicts them; but the inference he would have us derive here is, that doctrines may be distinguished into primary and secondary; that the first are all contained in the Creed, and the second only added in the Articles. Granting that doctrines may be so distinguished, the position is wholly untenable, for this reason, that the doctrines of the Creed itself may, nay must, be distinguished into primary and secondary likewise. Who will contend that the belief in one God, and in the communion of saints, whatever is meant by that obscure expression, are of equal importance? Besides, it is a legitimate conclusion, that those articles of faith not expressed in the Creed, granting even that they may be inferred from it, are yet of less importance than those which are expressed; therefore it follows, that according to the Creed it is more essential to believe in the communion of saints than to believe in the atonement. We say

then, that to take the Creed as the standard of essentials, notwithstanding the great names which may be advanced in support of the position, and among these we regret to say that of Chillingworth must be included, is a mischievous error, adopted without warrant, and like other notions in religion so adopted, containing in it the germ of "the mystery of iniquity."

Before we can receive "the Creed," on what Mr. Newman calls "Episcopal Tradition" (p. 297.), the fact that the Creed was so handed down by bishops must be proved. The Creed, as we have seen, is not mentioned by name till near the end of the fourth century, and therefore cannot be proved to have been handed down by episcopal or any other tradition. The scriptural "form of sound words" was not "the Creed," if so, it would be inspired, which Mr. Newman denies, but the faith of a Christian, which is to be found in Scripture itself; it is not safe to rest our faith on any other foundation.

Mr. Newman having determined that the passage in Ephesians iv. 11. "And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists," must refer to the visible church, is forced to alter the meaning of the word "prophet" to make it suit, since the gift of prophecy, confessedly, does not now exist. According to him, prophets are not

men who foretell things to come, but merely interpreters (p. 298.). If the meaning of one word or of one passage in Scripture may be changed without warrant, so may others; and where are we to stop; or rather, if we have any regard to truth, why are we to begin? If there are any authorised interpreters of Scripture, we ask, Who are they? Who authorised them? Do they uniformly agree among themselves? if not, they cannot be authorised. Until these questions are satisfactorily answered, we will hold fast by the word of God, who "cannot lie," and not follow what, for any thing we can tell, may be no better than "profane and vain babblings," whether dignified by the title of "Episcopal" or "Prophetical Tradition," or any other high-sounding term. All that St. Paul "committed" to Timothy we believe to be contained in the Bible; we are quite certain that no man living can prove that he committed any thing else.

But "for a time, the whole church agreed in one and the same account of it," viz. Prophetical Tradition (p. 300.). If so, this agreement did not last long, for "the mystery of iniquity" had already begun when St. Paul wrote his second epistle to the Thessalonians. Mr. Newman has much to say on the subject of Tradition, but it is sufficient to reply to his speculations, for they are nothing better, in the words he has himself quoted from Athanasius,

p. 387.:—"Either then deny the Holy Scriptures, or, if you acknowledge them, do not indulge speculations beyond what is written, which will do irreparable mischief."

The notion, "that there are matters of doctrine true, yet not necessary" (p. 301.), as so stated, is inaccurate. No man can be safe in rejecting any doctrine, which he really believes the Bible to contain; for the Bible is the word of God, and "he that believeth not God, hath made him a liar:" neither can it be maintained, that God has spoken to men more truths than are necessary, for this is to deny his wisdom; but there may be, and doubtless are, truths contained in the Bible, which many men do not perceive. We maintain, that it is the duty of all men to "search the Scriptures" as far as they are able; whether they do so search with a desire to know the truth or not, is a matter between their creator and their own souls.

To tolerate "private judgment" only "in lesser matters, so that our conclusions be not pertinaciously urged" (p. 302.), is merely to tolerate hypocrisy. A man who has a real regard for truth will urge his conclusions pertinaciously, and it is better for society that he should do so; how else is truth to be elicited? It is apparent, that the unity on which Mr. Newman and the Romanists insist so much, is uniformity only. There never yet was a

stifler of thought who did not at the same time inculcate meanness of soul. It seems strange, that it should be necessary now to remind men of what the wisest and best of all ages, both by precept and example have taught, that the search of truth is the noblest and most peculiar prerogative of man.

Mr. Newman, having contended that the creed is to be interpreted implicitly as well as explicitly, asks himself the natural question, "Is there any limit to that faith which the Creed represents? I answer, there is no precise limit; nor is it necessary there should be" (p. 303.). But we have a question to ask also, that is, Why the words used in the Creed are to mean so much more than the same words used any where else? If the words of the Creed may be interpreted to mean any thing, they may as well be interpreted to mean nothing; and its usefulness as a summary of faith is at an end.

"It is the duty of every one," says Mr. Newman (p. 304.), "either to believe and love what he hears, or to wish to do so, or at least, not to oppose, but to be silent." "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good," says St. Paul. (1. Thess. v. 21.)

As to the "right of opposing" the truth (p. 305.), I know not who contends for it, though many act upon it, more especially the Church of Rome. That "the church catholic is more likely to be right than a private individual," is not a proposition uni-

versally true. Luther dissented from the church visible, which cannot be distinguished from the church catholic, and all Protestants hold Luther to have been right and the church wrong. Truth dwells in the hearts of good men, not in that of a tyrannical Gregory, a murderous Innocent, or an Alexander polluted with every crime.

The text, "the pillar and ground of the truth," we understand to refer to the church mystical, not to the church visible, which was a pillar of falsehood for centuries together.

We are tired of noticing Mr. Newman's flimsy sophistries, inconsistencies, and insinuations. Will nothing open the eyes of his deluded followers? Thus, in the following passage, he calls the Creed revelation — a notion, as he is well aware, wholly without proof, and inconsistent with his own denial of its inspiration! How is it possible that the Creed can be revealed and not inspired?

"Every word of revelation has a deep meaning. It is the outward form of a heavenly truth, and in this sense a mystery, or sacrament. We may read it; confess it; but there is something in it which we cannot fathom, which we only more or less, as the case may be, not perfectly, enter into. Accordingly, when a candidate for baptism repeats the articles of the Creed, he is confessing something incomprehensible in its depth, and indefinite

in its extent" (p. 306.). That the faith of a Christian is incomprehensible in its depth, we readily admit; but again we repeat, this is distinct from the Creed. We have no warrant for taking the Creed, or any book but the Bible, to contain the Christian faith. They who comprise the Christian faith, in any compilation of merely human authority, do so at their peril.

Mr. Newman would have us receive the teaching of the church catholic, as a child receives the teaching of its mother; but there is no analogy between the cases. A child knows its mother, and when it hears her words, knows that they are its mother's. Unless the church catholic be the same with the church visible (and if it be the same, it has both taught and teaches falsehood), we cannot tell which is the church catholic, except by the test of Scripture only, a test necessarily implying private judgment. As Protestants we refuse to listen to no man, but we will "prove all things" by the word of God. We see no safety in any other course.

Mr. Newman says, the church "does not force a way by violence" (p. 308.). Yet he would have "troublers of the Christian community," as he calls them, "silenced, or put out of it" (p. 5.). Among the most prominent of such troublers at the present time, we include himself and his followers, and therefore we would have them, as heretics, put out

of the Church of England, but not "silenced;" let them talk their fill; we think not so meanly of the power of truth as to dread discussion.

Mr. Newman indulges in much declamation, in describing the character and privileges of the church. We answer, the privileges of the church, that is, of Christian men, must depend upon the purity of their faith and lives: "Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think any thing as of ourselves; but our sufficiency is of God." Mr. Newman's church is an unmeaning abstraction, which cannot be proved ever to have existed.

Mr. Newman asks himself the questions, "What is meant by the church catholic at this day? Where is she? how does she speak?" (p. 310.) But he does not answer them. It is a miserable substitute for an answer to talk of "the difficulty of applying the test," and that "men evade what they do not like," and so on. If by "the test" he meant the test of Vincentius, that we must believe what was taught "always, every where, and by all," the exceptions are so large as to swallow up the rule, and still we are without a reason why we are to adopt it.

The assertion, that "in the primitive church all Christians every where spoke one and the same doctrine *", is really monstrous, and repeatedly

* See the quotation from Hilary, *post*, p. 203.

disproved by Mr. Newman himself. "The mystery of iniquity" began in St. Paul's life-time, and therefore all Christians did not every where speak the same doctrine even then, much less afterwards. Neither were novelties formerly stifled at once, any more than they are now. Was the heresy of Arius "at once stifled?" It was "denounced," doubtless, and so are heresies now, but that denunciation did not prevent it from prevailing for a long period, and to a great extent, throughout the Christian world.

Mr. Newman comes very rapidly to the conclusion, that "to follow the church, in this day, is to follow the Prayer-book" (p. 313.). We say, that to follow the true church, the mystical body of Christ, is to follow the Bible, to which the Prayer-book is, in some respects, contradictory, as in confounding regeneration with baptism, and in claiming for priests the power of forgiving and retaining sins. We say also, that to follow the Church of England is to follow the Articles, and the articles on the sacraments are, as we have seen, irreconcileable with the baptismal service.

"Did we receive the Creed as our gospel," as Mr. Newman would have us (p. 314.), we should be guilty both of superstition and of impiety: of superstition by over-valuing the words of man, and of impiety by degrading the words of God.

Mr. Newman is schismatical as well as heretical. He would exclude from the church those who are more truly members of it than himself. Thus he says, "Nor is there any thing in the profession of the sects around us to disturb us. They contradict each other, or rather themselves. They pretend to no antiquity, they have no stability, no consistency. . . . . They have taken a different line, and occupy a different province" (p. 314.).

Doubtless the differences between Mr. Newman and the Romanists on the one side, and the orthodox Protestant Dissenters on the other, are great and serious; but the differences between these last and the Church of England relate chiefly, if not wholly, to matters of rites, ceremonies, and church government. The true members of the Church of England differ much more from Mr. Newman than from the orthodox Dissenters. As to the antiquity of Dissenters, if they teach the doctrines of the Bible, they are older than the Romanists and Mr. Newman, whatever these last may pretend. It is greatly to be regretted, that any who really love the Gospel of Christ should allow themselves to be separated by mere "carnal ordinances," or to speak with harshness, and even with bitterness of each other for such a cause. Can the real ministers of the Church of England deny that there are in-

deed those among the Dissenters who truly "preach Christ crucified," who faithfully testify against "the corruption that is in the world through lust?" Why then are you "ashamed to call them brethren?" Not so did our Lord, not so did Moses, not so did St. Paul. Thus it is written, "And John answered and said, Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name; and we forbad him, because he followeth not with us. And Jesus said unto him, Forbid him not: for he that is not against us is for us." * (Luke ix. 49.) And again, "And there ran a young man, and told Moses, and said, Eldad and Medad do prophesy in the camp. And Joshua the son of Nun, the servant of Moses, one of his young men, answered and said, My lord Moses, forbid them. And Moses said unto him, Enviest thou for my sake? would God that all the Lord's people were prophets, and that the Lord would put his Spirit upon them!" (Numbers xi. 27.) So also St. Paul, "Some indeed preach Christ even of envy and strife; and some also of good will: the one preach Christ of contention, not sincerely, supposing to add affliction to my bonds: but the other of love, knowing that I am set for the defence of the

* It is true that it is elsewhere said, "He that is not with me is against me;" but these passages cannot be contradictory; the former obviously refers to attack, and the latter to defence.

Gospel. What then? notwithstanding, every way, whether in pretence, or in truth, Christ is preached; and I therein do rejoice, yea, and will rejoice." (Philip. i. 15.) Can we read these passages and mistake the spurious Catholicism for the true?

It is natural that men who recoil from Protestantism, should lean to Romanism; but they must not be suffered to betray the church to which in name only they belong, by representing her doctrines as identical with their own. Thus we deny, most unequivocally, that the Church of England agrees with that of Rome in maintaining "the application of Christ's merits through external rites" (p. 316.). On the contrary, we charge the Romanists and Mr. Newman with heresy on this very ground. The doctrine of the Church of England is, that the holiest of rites, viz. sacraments, have "a wholesome effect" in such only "as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive" them; and the eleventh article expressly declares, that we are "justified by faith only," which is incompatible with the application of Christ's merits through rites.

The distinction is fundamental, and the very corner-stone of Protestantism itself. The right of private judgment is, as it were, the external badge of Protestantism; "justification by faith only" is its very essence. To those who have not embraced

this doctrine, Romanism is a mere corruption of Christianity; to those who have, it is a foul and most pernicious heresy.

There are three opinions as to the mode in which men may obtain eternal happiness. The first is, by obedience to God's law; but this is a condition which no man has fulfilled; none can examine their own hearts, without feeling that there is something to be repented of in the very best things they do. Will they make themselves more holy than the prophet Isaiah, who has called "all our righteousness filthy rags," or than the apostle Paul, who has said, "that in me, that is in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing"? Whatever men may heedlessly say, who is there that will dare, at the last day, to challenge acceptance with his Maker as a right?

The second opinion is, that men are saved by rites and ceremonies, penances, and such like. Now, although the atonement of Christ is here nominally introduced, it is in reality irrelevant and may be rejected, since the purpose of its introduction does not appear. There is no necessary relation between the atonement and outward rites. The application of the atonement is within, invisible; its effect is exclusively on the will and the understanding. Rites are outward, visible, material. They who maintain the inherent efficacy of rites, are in this difficulty, that unless they will

consent to involve themselves in the most revolting absurdities, they must somewhere draw a line, and this, confessedly, they cannot do. The doctrine of the Romanists and that of the Hindoos is substantially the same. Take the extreme Romanist opinion, that of those

> "who, to be sure of Paradise,
> Dying put on the weeds of Dominic,
> Or in Franciscan thought to pass disguised;"*

And we ask how much less absurd is it than the notion of the Hindoos, that a man might become equal to the gods, by standing for a hundred years on one leg! If rites have an inherent efficacy, it must be applied to all who participate in them indiscriminately, for so far all are equal; yet carry out this position to its legitimate consequences, and all goodness is rooted out from among men. It is repugnant to almost every page of the Bible and to the character of God as a moral judge. And this is no baseless theory, but a fact confirmed by history; for during the dark ages, when the Church of Rome bore unlimited sway, gross wickedness was the practical consequence of attributing an inherent efficacy to rites and ceremonies. To take a determinate period, I will venture to assert as an historical fact, which may be proved if disputed, that men were generally more wicked during

* Milton.

the eleventh and twelfth centuries than during the better ages of the Grecian and Roman republics. Conscience, among the men who then called themselves Christians, was more blinded and perverted than among Heathens.

There is indeed an intermediate opinion, which is a sort of mixture of the other three, that men are saved partly by works, partly by rites, and partly by faith. Now, when we speak of good works, we must be understood to speak relatively only, as between man and man, not absolutely, as between man and God. There is in this notion a secret degradation of the infinite purity of the divine nature to the level of our own. Even sins of ignorance could not be forgiven without expiation, as we find in Leviticus, iv. 2. Strictly speaking, we have no good works, and therefore we cannot in any degree be justified by them. As to rites, either they have an inherent efficacy or they have not; if they have, it applies equally to all men, good or bad, infidels or believers; if they have not, their efficacy must be determined by the inward disposition of the recipient. This disposition we call faith, and we maintain that "it is the gift of God."

We come then to the third, or Protestant doctrine, that "we are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour

Jesus Christ, by faith."* The great objection to this doctrine is included in the question asked by St. Paul, "Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound? God forbid." The fallacy lies in the assumption, that justification by faith is an opinion only, and not a principle of action. Because, to take the distinction of an old writer, they who are so justified "work from life, not for life," it is assumed that they do not work at all. If we do not abhor and forsake sin, if we do not delight in God's law, we have not faith, and are not justified. By our unassisted reason we may discern divine things to be true, for God hath "not left himself without witness;" as good we can discern them only by "the Spirit of adoption," as Hooker observes. If we have true faith, we shall not think "His commandments grievous," but strive to fulfil them, although our perception of our own unworthiness, and of God's purity, will be greatly increased.

But it may be said, to maintain "justification by faith only," is to deny all efficacy to the sacraments. We answer, not so; the sacraments are both badges of our Christian profession, and powerful means of grace, if rightly received; but they are only "generally necessary to salvation," not absolutely and in all cases; the thief on the cross was not baptized. Righteousness was imputed to

* Art. XI.

Abraham, "not in circumcision, but in uncircumcision;" the sins of the "woman which was a sinner" were forgiven before baptism. If baptism is to be held absolutely necessary to salvation in the case of every Christian, it would follow that a heathen convert, dying suddenly before baptism could be administered to him, would be in a worse condition than if he had remained unconverted, since it cannot be maintained that the salvation of the virtuous heathen is impossible. It is clear, therefore, that rites cannot be held absolutely and universally necessary; but "without faith it is impossible to please God." The case put is of the nature of a crucial instance.

There is no doctrine in the Church of Christ older, or better supported by authority, than that of "justification by faith only." It is, as we have seen, the doctrine of Clement of Rome and Polycarp, two fathers whose antiquity and authority are inferior to none; it is the cardinal doctrine of Luther and the great reformers; it is the doctrine of the eleventh article and of the Homilies of the Church of England; it is the doctrine of Hooker, the highest authority among English divines, and developed by him at length in an elaborate sermon, perhaps unequalled in our language in profound piety, dignity of expression, and force of reasoning. But we deny that any or all of these are or can be

clearer than the Bible, of which the doctrine of the atonement is throughout the great theme, and justification by faith alone the personal application of it. "By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast."

"Then what," says Hooker, "is the fault of the Church of Rome? Not that she requireth works at their hands that will be saved; but that she attributeth unto works a power of satisfying God for sin; and a virtue to merit both grace here, and in heaven glory. That this overthroweth the foundation of faith, I grant willingly; that it is a direct denial thereof, I utterly deny." * If indeed it were a direct denial, we could not admit Rome to be even a visible Church. But let us see where this notion of works will carry us. The more a man works, the more grace he necessarily receives; and the more grace again, the more he works; so that grace and works mutually increase in a sort of geometrical progression, until at length he has more than he wants for his own use. Yet here, even if we concede that any works may be in themselves absolutely meritorious, it is not enough; their merit must be retrospective as well as prospective to enable them to save the soul; and that they are so retrospective is an assumption only. Works and grace becoming thus redund-

* Vol. iii. p. 661.

ant, the Church seizes, by what title it is hard to say, upon the superfluities of the saint, locks them up in her spiritual chest, and sells them to the sinner for money! thus, in addition to all the rest, committing the very sin of Simon Magus. The moral and religious are not the only objections to this monstrous mass of folly and wickedness. There is a philosophical objection which alone is fatal to indulgences. Money is material, visible; the merit of good works, even if absolute, is not a thing which we can see or touch. The deluded man who gives money for an indulgence or pardon has, and can have, no assurance beyond the bare word of his priest that he receives any thing in return. If "a good legal hope" be confessedly difficult (we say it is unattainable), what is a bought legal hope, where the seller can prove no title, and the purchaser no transfer? We say, then, that Romanism is a heresy, and not a mere corruption of Christianity. It is not, as some may fondly imagine, a beautiful statue, incrusted over with the slime of antiquity, but revealing, through every incumbrance, the various harmony of proportion, the careless simplicity of grace; it is rather a barbarous idol, mimicking with its deformed contortions the serene majesty of the fabulous god of life and light.

CHAP. IV.

Of the eleventh Lecture "on Scripture as the Record of Faith," a considerable portion has been already considered. We proceed therefore to a question of great importance, wherein we charge Mr. Newman with maintaining heresy no less distinctly than we so charge him on the ground of his opinions as to justification. He says, that "Protestant sectaries" believe individuals "to have a direct power over Scripture, to contemplate questions of what is *true* and *false* in opinion, to have a special gift by divine illumination, a gift guaranteed by promise, of discerning the Scripture sense without perceptible human *Media*, to act under a guidance, and as if inspired, though not really so. Whether any such gift was once destined for mankind or not, it avails not to inquire; we consider it is not given in fact, and both Romanists and Protestants hold it is given" (p. 321.).

Now the doctrine in question, which is as much that of the Church of England as it can be of "Protestant sectaries," is not fairly stated. We do not maintain that any men "have a direct power over Scripture;" but that all who "search the

Scriptures" with humility, prayer, and an earnest desire to know the truth, will be led by the Spirit into all truth necessary for their salvation. We distinguish, and the distinction must be familiar to Mr. Newman, between the extraordinary and the ordinary operations of the Spirit;—the extraordinary, described with such nervous fervour by the prophet Jeremiah,—"His word was in mine heart as a burning fire shut up in my bones, and I was weary with forbearing, and I could not stay;"—and the ordinary, in the words of Hooker, "common to all true Christian men."

But this is not the only office of the Spirit. It is held by divines, and by Chillingworth among others, certainly neither a sectary or a fanatic, that each of the Three Persons in the Holy Trinity has a peculiar office in the redemption of every Christian soul; and that of sanctification is generally ascribed to the Spirit. We trust to shew that these two doctrines, as to the personal agency of the Spirit, rest on most sure scriptural ground, and also that they are both the doctrine of the Church of England. The gift of the Spirit is expressly promised to all believers. "If ye being evil," says our Lord, "know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much rather shall my heavenly Father give his Holy Spirit to them that ask him." There is no restriction in this promise; it is clearly

made to all believers in all ages. But, without the Spirit salvation is impossible, for "no man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost;" and, "if any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of his." Also it is said in the same chapter wherein we find the last text, the eighth of Romans,—"For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die: but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body ye shall live. For as many as are led by the Spirit of God they are the sons of God. For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God." And afterwards, —"Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities; for we know not what we should pray for as we ought." And again, in 2 Thess. ii. 13.—"But we are bound to give thanks alway to God for you, brethren beloved of the Lord, because God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth." It is plain, then, that the offices of leading into the truth and sanctifying every believer, are in Scripture peculiarly and emphatically applied to the Holy Spirit.

The doctrine of the Church of England on these points, may be thus given in the words of Hooker:

— "That saving truth, which is far above the reach of human reason, cannot otherwise, than by the Spirit of the Almighty be conceived;" and "the proper and most immediate efficient cause in us of Christian righteousness, is, the Spirit of adoption which we have received into our hearts."* The seventeenth article is to the same effect — "Wherefore they which be endued with so excellent a benefit of God, be called according to God's purpose by his Spirit working in due season: they through grace obey the calling: they be justified freely: they be made sons of God by adoption: they be made like the image of his only-begotten Son Jesus Christ: they walk religiously in good works, and at length by God's mercy, they attain everlasting felicity."

It will be remembered that Mr. Newman professes peculiar reverence for the Prayer Book. On this subject the Prayer Book entirely agrees with the Articles. Thus, the Collect for Quinquagesima Sunday ascribes the gift of charity or sanctification to the Holy Spirit: —

"O Lord, who hast taught us that all our doings without charity are nothing worth; send thy Holy Ghost, and pour into our hearts that most excellent gift of charity, the very bond of peace, and of all virtues; without which whosoever liveth is counted

* Vol. iii. 642. 631.

dead before thee. Grant this for thine only Son Jesus Christ's sake."

The Collect for Whit-Sunday ascribes the gift of right judgment to the Holy Spirit:—

"God, who as at this time didst teach the hearts of thy faithful people, by sending to them the light of thy Holy Spirit; grant us by the same Spirit to have a right judgment in all things, and evermore to rejoice in his holy comfort, through the merits of Christ Jesus our Saviour; who liveth and reigneth with thee in the unity of the same Spirit, one God, world without end."

We say, then, that Mr. Newman's denial of a special divine gift to all true believers is heretical, and contrary to the doctrine of the Church of England.

The doctrine of sanctification by the Holy Spirit is necessarily connected with that of justification by faith only, inasmuch as it wholly excludes justification by works.

The words of Mr. Newman, "Scripture is an infringement on our right of private judgment," (p. 325.), are a childish mis-statement of a point already discussed. Without Scripture we should have nothing to judge. Scripture is our only informant in matters of doctrine, because, according to himself, "Scripture only is inspired." Not that we contend that no knowledge is attainable by the

light of nature; that is not the question here, although it may be remarked that there is this essential distinction between natural and revealed knowledge; that we can know nothing of God but through God, we can know only from Him what He is.

Scripture "demands our assent" undoubtedly, but we must exercise our understandings as to what Scripture means; and this, together with the genuineness and authenticity of Scripture, is the whole question of private judgment, and nothing more. If men are not to exercise their understandings as to the meaning of Scripture, they must as to the meaning of its interpreters; and how are they to know that the interpreters may not be wrong, and why are they not to begin at the fountain-head?

It is very easy to get over the difficulty by saying, "How the Church and the individual adjust their respective judgments, is a mere case of relative duties, as that between a master and scholar, or parent and child." (p. 326.) The scholar knows his master; and the child knows his parent; but the Church Catholic is not so easily determined. Mr. Newman, not satisfied, as we are, with the Bible, has tried to furnish us with another test, but he has entirely failed; his test is as indeterminate as the thing to be tested. His test of "matters of inferior moment" is of precisely the same character; they are within the cognisance of private judgment, but,

as it appears, in conjunction only with that indeterminate body the Church; and, as if the difficulty of adjusting the indeterminate claims of an indeterminate body were not enough, neither the Church nor the individual can know whether such are inferior matters or not, unless "Scripture or tradition is obscure, indeterminate, or silent." (p. 325.) Can a better scheme be devised for rendering truth impossible to be ascertained! It is sufficient for us to receive the Bible only as our authority, without involving ourselves, and that too gratuitously, in such a maze of absurdities.

As we do not admit the pseudo-Athanasian Creed to be scriptural, we care not for any argument as to what is "catholic," which may be adduced therefrom. "Physician, heal thyself." That the author or authors of the so-called Athanasian Creed were more anxious to determine what they considered "catholic" than what was scriptural, may well be; if so, Protestants will not on that account be more disposed to acknowledge it.

Mr. Newman objects to the words of Chillingworth, that "nothing is necessary to be believed but what is plainly revealed." (p. 329.) He should also have objected to Augustine, Chrysostom, and other fathers on the same ground.* His answer,

* See the opinions of the fathers on this point, collected by Tillotson, at the end of his "Rule of Faith."

"I cannot allow that a revelation, if made, must necessarily be plain, or that faith requires clear knowledge," is ambiguous, and not to the point. Chillingworth does not pretend to determine *à priori* what a revelation must be, but only that men must know what they are to believe before they can believe; for how is it possible they can do otherwise? —and that whatever is generally necessary to salvation is plainly revealed. Mr. Newman's words seem to imply that Chillingworth required entire comprehension of the whole matter to be believed before belief, but nothing was further from the opinions of that great man than the childish and atheistical sophism that we can believe nothing without thoroughly understanding it, as if it were a mathematical problem. There is much, doubtless, in religion that is most mysterious; but so there is in the physical world around us. All that Chillingworth requires is that the matter of belief shall be clearly propounded, not comprehended by our narrow understandings in all its parts.

Certainly it would be very presumptuous to say, that there is an antecedent necessity that the word of God should be written; an opinion which Hooker and Butler most justly condemn, and which is also contrary to many passages in Chillingworth. We are not to limit His power, or to prescribe for Him

in what manner truth shall be preserved in the hearts of men:—but who says it?

Chillingworth does not say, "I will believe nothing unless I am told it in the clearest conceivable form;" this is a much stronger expression than "plainly revealed." There are many degrees of certainty: certainty not less than what men habitually act upon, we maintain to be also a sufficient warrant for religious belief; and, it may be added, if men who reject the Bible, habitually act upon evidence less certain than that for the Bible, they condemn themselves, and prove that insufficient evidence is not their motive for rejecting revelation. Our warrant for rejecting all unwritten doctrines is not antecedent necessity, but Scripture itself.

We cannot admit that "the abolition of the seventh day comes to us upon tradition." (p. 330.) The substitution of the first day of the week for the seventh may he collected from Scripture. "Let no man judge you in respect of the sabbath days*," says St. Paul; and we read of the disciples being together on the first day of the week. There is a reason also for the change, because our Lord rose from the dead on that day. Neither is it strictly speaking a matter of doctrine, which day of the seven shall be observed; certainly not more so than the rejected practice of administering the commu-

* Coloss. ii. 16.

nion to infants. We do not consider that the principle, which we hold to be sound both in religion and politics, that every thing is to be received which we find established, unless we can give a reason for rejecting it, has any thing to do with tradition in the Popish sense of the word.

Our real grounds for holding the sufficiency and perfection of Scripture in matters of doctrine are in the first place Scripture itself; and secondly, the impossibility of verifying our faith by any other means, which, as I trust, has been already shewn. The first point only then remains to be considered.

"Scripture" says Mr. Newman, p. 331., no where says that it, by itself, contains all necessary doctrine;" yet, St. Paul says to Timothy, "the Holy Scriptures are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus." If they are so able, they must contain all that is necessary. They must also contain all that is necessary, because no other revelation can be proved, and because all addition to them is expressly forbidden. Of what books the Scriptures consist, is not the point here; that we ascertain by evidence internal and external. But having once ascertained the canon, which, be it remembered, the Church of England has done, and declared, that it "containeth all things necessary to salvation," where Scripture speaks generally of itself, we give its language a

general interpretation: thus the text in 2 Tim. iii. 16.,— "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God," must refer to all written revelation, antecedent and subsequent, when ascertained, because it is all equally Scripture; but the books of Scripture are certainly not ascertainable by this text. Mr. Newman, in referring this text to the Old Testament only, because the New was not then completed, is plainly unsound. What possible warrant can there be for limiting the passage in Proverbs, xxx. 5., to the Scriptures then written? — "Every word of God is pure: he is a shield unto them that put their trust in him. Add thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar." It is the "word of God" which is here spoken of; and the New Testament is as much the "word of God" as the Old. Neither do we limit the passages in Deuteronomy, iv. 2., and xii. 32., to the Jews only:— "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it:" "What thing soever I command you, observe to do it: thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it." The Jewish ceremonial law was indeed repealed, but it was by divine authority. These texts clearly apply to all the words and commandments of God, whether antecedent or subsequent, and nothing can be proved to be his word which is not written. "The last words of the Apocalypse,"

if "the sole declaration in the books of the New Testament of an exclusive character" (p. 332.), are certainly not the sole declaration to that effect in the Bible, although the most awful and impressive; and we give them a general, and not a particular interpretation, on the grounds already mentioned, and because, if we were to interpret them of the book of Revelations only, that book would be placed under a more solemn sanction than any other books in the Bible; which must be equal to each other, if all are alike God's word. "If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life."

Because we believe "that the text of Scripture is not to be taken literally, concerning our washing one another's feet" (p. 334.), it is contended, that our interpretation must be traditive. But there are many passages of Scripture which we do not interpret literally; — as, "If thine eye offend thee, pluck it out and cast it from thee;" "And unto him that smiteth thee on the one cheek, offer also the other." Is our interpretation of all these passages traditive? Is there any traditive interpretation of any scriptural passage? If so, what is it, — how is it proved?—who delivered it, and to whom?

To say, that because all agree that some scriptural texts are not to be taken literally, the interpretation must be traditive, is no consequence. That all texts are not to be taken literally is clear from Scripture itself.

"But our divines, such as Bramhall, Bull, Pearson, and Patrick, believe that the blessed Mary was 'Ever Virgin,' as the Church has called her; but tradition was their only informant on the subject: thus there are true traditions still remaining to us" (p. 335.).

Mr. Newman has passed through the schools of Oxford; did he there learn that a true syllogism admits of a doubtful middle term, or, that a universal conclusion can be derived from particular premises? To make the conclusion legitimate, the major premiss should stand thus:—Whatever Bramhall, Bull, Pearson, and Patrick, believed, is true; or, — Whatever Bramhall, Bull, Pearson, and Patrick, believed on tradition, is true. To the first, "I deny your major," is a sufficient answer: the second assumes the point to be proved, viz., the truth of tradition.

But if we grant, what cannot be proved, that "there are true traditions still remaining to us," what then? How do we know that there are not false traditions also? and how are we to discriminate the false traditions from the true? Again,

and again we say, that the moment we suffer ourselves to wander beyond the Bible, we have no security that we shall believe the truth. If "it so happens that no doctrine coming from the apostles is to be found any where" but in Scripture, it is gratuitous and unphilosophical to take tradition as an authority jointly with Scripture: it is to take that as a joint cause which cannot be proved to be more than an effect.

But it might be said, that "some books, as the epistle to the Laodiceans, are altogether lost." This, and much more might be said, doubtless, but can it be proved that any inspired book has been lost? And let it be remembered, that even if it could be proved that any book written by an apostle had been lost, this is not enough; it must also be proved to have been inspired; which it is absurd in itself, and contrary to Scripture, to suppose that every writing of the apostles was. St. Paul expressly declares, on one occasion, that he was not inspired: "I have no commandment of the Lord: yet I give my judgment, as one that hath obtained mercy of the Lord to be faithful." (1 Cor. vii. 25.)

Again, we know not that "the book of Jasher," mentioned in Joshua, x. 13., was inspired. Scripture is indeed expressly against such a supposition, or at least against the supposition that any lost book could contain additional matter; for all

Scripture is the word of God, and it is written, "the word of our God shall stand for ever." (Isa. xl. 8.)

In insidious insinuation Mr. Newman has little to learn from any Jesuit. A Romanist is here supposed to speak, but he is not answered. "The office of the Church, as 'the keeper of Holy Writ,' seems to make it probable that she was intended to interpret, perhaps to supply, what Scripture left irregular and incomplete" (p. 337.). "The keeper of Holy Writ" is the true mystical Church, not the idolatrous Romanists, who did indeed keep it as a sealed volume as long as they could. But grant the Church to be a keeper, is she therefore an interpreter? Because she is one thing, is she therefore another? That Scripture is incomplete, is an assumption; if any Church, or any men, add to Scripture, we know from Scripture that they are "accursed." Again, "The circumstance that religious truths can be conveyed by ordinances, or by Catholic tradition, as well as by writing, seems an intimation that there is such a second rule of faith, equally authoritative and binding with Scripture itself." How can truths be conveyed by ordinances? But they may by tradition. Be it so. Hear the conclusion insinuated by our orthodox logician:—Because they may be, therefore they are.

After the specimens of reasoning we have had, it

is very natural that Mr. Newman should remark that "the great discoverers of principles do not reason" (p. 339.), and leave his readers to draw the inference.

It is not necessary to consider Mr. Newman's perpetual repetitions of the same sophisms. We are not "content to accept the canonicity of Scripture on *faith*" (p. 343.). The canonicity of Scripture is not a subject of faith, but of reason, as Hooker has shewn. We receive Scripture on evidence, historical and internal; we will reject neither. If we received it without any reason, we should disobey St. Paul, who commands us to "prove all things;" and St. Peter, who commands us to "be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you."

Mr. Newman insidiously remarks, that "the Articles contain no recognition of the inspiration of Scripture" (p. 344.). The Articles recognise the books of the canon, which is all we require. The inspiration of Scripture is established by itself. We deny that there are "great truths not in the Articles;" if so, what are they?

The next Lecture "on Scripture, as the Record of our Lord's Teaching," will not detain us long. It is characterised by the same dangerously speculative spirit which we have so often remarked in Mr. Newman, and which appears also to have characterise

the early heretics. That one portion of Scripture, viz. "the words and works" of our Lord, is "sacred beyond other portions;" as Mr. Newman insinuates, is a matter we have no warrant for believing. We do not consider ourselves to have any warrant for esteeming the words of the Son of higher authority than those of the Holy Spirit. What warrant, indeed, can we have for such an opinion? The final revelation of Christianity was subsequent to our Lord's crucifixion. That all Christianity is contained in any one book or books of the New Testament is a matter of pure speculation, entirely useless, and which may be mischievous. The insinuation, that "perhaps portions of such," viz. oral, "instructions" of our Lord "remain among us" (p. 354.), is quite in Mr. Newman's usual spirit. He is aware that there is not satisfactory evidence for any.

Limiting the inspiration of the apostles to "understanding in our Lord's words, and the gift of prophecy" (p. 363.), is another speculation, wholly unwarrantable, and plainly mischievous.

Mr. Newman at length admits, "that tradition, by itself, and without Scripture warrant, does not convey to us any article necessary to salvation." (p. 370.) How, then, on his own shewing, can he be free from schism in excluding from the Church Protestant dissenters who receive all Scripture, and therefore all articles necessary to salvation?

The admission is specious, but, on examination, it will be found "false and hollow;" for tradition is assumed to be the interpreter of Scripture, and the interpretation is the whole question. That such is Mr. Newman's view, is immediately apparent. "Scripture," he says in the next page, "does not interpret itself, or answer objections to misinterpretations. We must betake ourselves to the early Church, and see how they understood it." Here we are at issue on every point. We maintain that Scripture is the best interpreter of Scripture; we see no necessity for betaking ourselves to the early Church for an interpretation; and if we do, we are satisfied that an unanimous interpretation is not to be found. Tertullian may observe, "that there is no end of disputing if we go to Scripture, whereas the joint testimony of the Catholic world is at once clear and unanswerable" (p. 373.). Yet the same Tertullian did not, even in his time, find this joint testimony sufficiently clear, for he appeals to Scripture, and not to the Catholic world, in another quotation in the same page:—"Let the school of Hermogenes shew us that it is mentioned in Scripture; if it is not in Scripture, let him fear the woe destined for those who add or take away." We see here that Tertullian obviously gave a general interpretation to the curse in the Revelations, and therefore would condemn those who now build their faith on the Prayer Book rather than on the Bible. But

it was a much easier thing to ascertain the joint testimony of the Catholic world in the time of Tertullian than now: are we, therefore, to determine the primitive ages with his death? For this no reason can be given; and still we shall not escape errors, for Tertullian was himself a Montanist.

Mr. Newman proceeds to quote many passages from the Fathers, to shew that Scripture was "the document of proof in the early Church;" but the Fathers are often inconsistent with each other, and sometimes with themselves. Thus Chrysostom and Athanasius contradict Tertullian: far from thinking that "there is no end of disputing if we go to Scripture," the first says,—"As a trusty door, Scripture shuts out heretics, securing us from error in whatsoever we desire; and unless we damage it we are unassailable by our enemies" (p. 379.): and Athanasius,—"But if ye desire to speak other things beyond what is written, why do you contend with us, who are determined neither to hear nor to speak beyond what is written, the Lord having said, 'If ye abide in my word ye shall be truly free'" (p. 388.). Again, Augustine thus emphatically condemns all traditions; yet, as we have seen, he permitted himself to speculate beyond the Bible, until he very nearly approached the Romish doctrine of purgatory: —

"If any one, in matters relating to Christ, or His Church, or any other thing which belongs to faith

or our life,—I will not say, if we, but even (what St. Paul has added) if an angel from Heaven shall preach unto you, besides what ye have received in the Scriptures of the Law and the Gospel, let him be accursed" (p. 380.).

John of Damascus, notwithstanding his defence of the worship of images, could write thus :—"It cannot be that we should preach, or at all know, any thing about God, besides what the holy oracles of the Old and New Testaments have set forth, said, or manifested to us" (p. 381.). Where, in the Bible, did he find any warrant for idolatry? Such mere mouth-honour as this costs nothing, and is worth nothing. There is ample evidence that the early Church was not purer or better than ours. Thus Mr. Newman himself quotes Basil of Cæsarea to the following effect (p. 419.) :"—

"Our afflictions are well known without my telling; the sound of them has gone forth over all Christendom. The opinions of the Fathers are despised; apostolical traditions are set at nought; the speculations of innovators hold sway in the churches. Men have learned to be theorists instead of theologians. The wisdom of the world has the place of honour, having dispossessed the boasting of the cross. The gravity of the sacred order has perished; there are none to feed the Lord's flock with knowledge; ambitious men are ever spending,

for purposes of self-indulgence and bribery, possessions which they hold in trust for the poor. The accurate observance of the Canons is no more; there is no restraint upon sin. The laity remain unchastised; the prelates have lost all freedom of speech, for they are necessarily the slaves of those by whose patronage they have gained their dignities. . . . . Unbelievers laugh at what they see, and the weak are unsettled; no one can tell where the true faith lies, because the adulterators of the word make plausible pretences to be true. The better sort of people keep silence; but every railer speaks what he will. Sacred things are profaned; those of the laity who are sound in faith avoid the places of worship as schools of blasphemy, and raise their voices in solitude with groans and tears to the God of Heaven."

Was this the period when "all Christians every where spoke one and the same doctrine?" But there is a yet more remarkable passage, not quoted by Mr. Newman, in Hilary, bishop of Poictiers, in the fourth century:—"It is a thing equally deplorable and dangerous, that there are at present as many creeds as there are opinions among men, as many doctrines as inclinations; and as many sources of blasphemy, as there are faults among us; because we make creeds arbitrarily, and explain them as arbitrarily. And as there is but one faith; so there

is but one only God, one Lord, and one baptism. We renounce this one faith, when we make so many different creeds; and that diversity is the reason why we have no true faith among us. We cannot be ignorant that, since the Council of Nice, we have done nothing but make creeds. And while we fight against words, litigate about new questions, dispute about equivocal terms, complain of authors, that every one may make his own party triumph; while we cannot agree, while we anathematise one another,—there is hardly one that adheres to Jesus Christ. What change was there not in the creed last year! The first council ordained a silence upon the Homoousion; the second established it, and would have us speak; the third excuses the fathers of the council, and pretends they took the word ousia simply; the fourth condemns them, instead of excusing them. With respect to the likeness of the Son of God to the Father, which is the faith of our deplorable times, they dispute whether he is like in whole, or in part. These are rare folks to unravel the secrets of heaven. Nevertheless it is for these creeds, about invisible mysteries, that we calumniate one another, and for our belief in God. We make creeds every year, nay every moon; we repent of what we have done; we defend those that repent, we anathematise those we defended. So we condemn either the doctrine of others in ourselves, or our own in that of others, and

reciprocally tearing one another to pieces, we have been the causes of each other's ruin." *

If the candid reader should think that there is some rhetorical exaggeration in the language of Basil and Hilary— a supposition certainly in accordance with the vicious taste of their times, but which does not strengthen the case of the blind followers of the Fathers —still, after making every allowance, it is sufficiently clear, that the early Church was not Mr. Newman's miracle of concord.

But his system is contrary to Scripture, the Church of England, antiquity, history, and common sense. Thus he refers the text, "all her children are taught of the Lord, and great is the peace of her children," to the Church generally. It is plain enough to every man who will permit himself to use his understanding unwarped by a theory, that this passage cannot refer to the visible Church, of which some of the worst men that ever lived have been members. It is plain from Scripture that it cannot; for, in every country nominally Christian, the visible Church is the world, containing both wheat and tares; and "the Spirit of truth the world cannot receive." Hooker refers all such passages to the mystical Church only. In order to reconcile his own view of the scriptural promises really made to the mystical

* The original of this passage is quoted, and thus translated by Locke in his "New Method of a Common-place Book."

Church, with the existing condition of the visible Church, Mr. Newman is driven to doubt "whether or not there are cases in which a branch of the Church, as an individual Christian, may utterly exhaust itself of grace, and become reprobate;" (p. 399.)—to doubt; that is, whether a man may not lead a life of sin, die without repentance, and yet be saved because he has been baptized or made a member of the Church; for "if we have been made God's children, we cannot unmake ourselves; we can never be mere natural men again." How does he know that many baptized persons have ever been other than natural men? What proof of a spiritual life do they give? How can men be Christians indeed who live in habitual sin, and, as far as human eyes can see, seldom or never think of religion at all? The difficulty is not evaded by calling such men "apostates,"— they have not deserted the true religion for the false. Either Mr. Newman's notions of baptism are wholly unsound; or all religion and all morality is concentrated in an outward ordinance, which in very many instances cannot be proved to have even any outward effect.* The apostles must have been baptized before the crucifixion, yet they were not wholly converted: "When thou art converted," says our Lord to Peter, "strengthen thy brethren." †

* Antè, p. 65. † Luke, xxii. 32.

Another great source of Mr. Newman's errors is "apostolical succession," or the assumed analogy between the Christian ministry and the Jewish priesthood. A regular succession of priests cannot now be proved, either among the Jews or among any other nation, for the priesthood is at an end; and if we had adhered strictly to the New Testament, the word priest would never among Christians have been confounded with minister. It is a relative term in its primary sense, and implies an altar and a sacrifice. Its very use is dishonouring to Christ, our great High-Priest, whose "holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices," all true Christians are. We therefore deny that the apostles "bequeathed" a formal succession at all — a point assumed by Mr. Newman, in his usual manner (p. 406.), as if it were incontrovertible, but an assumption which has led to most grievous errors and superstitions in the Christian world.

The errors here are indeed substantially the same with those relating to baptism, that "positive observances, not moral qualifications, are the conditions of supernatural agency." (p. 412.) We deny that such conditions exist. As members of the Church of England, we abhor the sordid sophism that salvation is a bargain between man and his Creator. The Christian dispensation is a covenant of grace. It is our glory to proclaim that we are "justified

freely ;" that our salvation " is neither of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy." But if the Arminian notion, that we are justified by works, which in truth we have not done, is degrading to the purity of the divine nature, what is the notion of Mr. Newman and the Romanists, that ordinances are the conditions of grace? Can "grace reign," and yet be bound to ordinances, which may be administered to the most worthless of mankind? That ordinances are conditions of divine agency may be Hindoo mythology, but certainly not Christian divinity.

The doctrine of the Church of England, that the unworthiness of ministers hinders not the effect of sacraments, if rightly received, is wholly different from this. Of ourselves, " we have no power to do good works pleasant and acceptable to God ; " therefore, we cannot rightly receive ordinances without " the grace of God, by Christ preventing us *; but the unworthiness of ministers can be no obstacle to divine grace.

When we turn to ecclesiastical history for proofs of apostolical succession, we find irregularities of every kind; yet all that can be said of any orthodox Protestant ministers, is, that their succession is irregular. We fear, however, Mr. Newman and his followers will not abandon their theory of formal

* Art. x.

apostolical succession, however untenable, because it furnishes them with an excuse for excluding Dissenters from the visible church, and is the key-stone of their system of ordinances; neither will they admit all faithful ministers to be real successors of the apostles, for so they would be convicted of schism out of their own mouths.

That in the primitive church, "all the great points of faith were thoroughly known by all, in a far higher way than is at present vouchsafed to us" (p. 417.), is a bare assertion, without proof, and completely at variance with the passage just quoted from Hilary.

But enough has been said. How can we do otherwise on the whole matter, than come to the conclusion of Protestantism, and Chillingworth, its most famous defender, than whom few have ever investigated any subject with knowledge more ample, with a love of truth more ardent, with a reason more clear and subtle, more forcible, or more victorious!

"The BIBLE, I say, the BIBLE only, is the religion of Protestants! Whatsoever else they believe besides it, and the plain, irrefragable, indubitable consequences of it, well may they hold it as a matter of opinion; but as matter of faith and religion, neither can they with coherence to their own grounds believe it themselves, nor require the belief of it of others without most high and most schismatical presumption.

that the Oxford Divines disclaim Popery, yet it is no less true that Rome views them, she must view them, as her forerunners, as useful auxiliaries to assist in the execution of her evident and vast designs. Who then, however obscure, if these things indeed be so, will not call loudly upon the true ministers of the church of Christ? Are you stewards, and will you not be faithful? Are you watchmen, and will you not give warning? Are you shepherds, and will you suffer the flock of Christ to be fed with that which profiteth not, to be given up to "strong delusion, that they should believe a lie"? What are the words of Ezekiel? "If the watchman see the sword come and blow not the trumpet, and the people be not warned; if the sword come, and take any person from among them, he is taken away in his iniquity; but his blood will I require at the watchman's hand." The way before you is indeed beset with difficulties, but faithfulness and courage can find a remedy for all evils. "Who art thou, that thou shouldest be afraid of a man that shall die, and of the son of man which shall be made as grass, and forgettest the Lord thy Maker, that hath stretched forth the heavens, and laid the foundations of the earth?" You are girt about with fortresses and points of vantage; you have armour of a celestial temper, and a city with strong walls and bulwarks. But "all inaccessible

places become smooth and level, where are wanting brave defenders."* If the bishops will not interfere; if the convocation cannot be summoned; if the passages in the ordination and baptismal services, which have favoured the introduction of these errors cannot be altered; if the orthodox Dissenters cannot be united with the Church of England without imposing on their ministers the insult of re-ordination; if fresh life-blood, and more comprehensive charity can by no means be infused into the church, threatened as she is on every side by enemies, whose hostility to her seems their only bond of union; yet, what can the true servants of Christ have really to fear? His ministers, if he grant them grace, can effectually denounce and arrest the progress of the worst errors. Who is against you, if God be for you? Why then will you not arise, and cast out "the accursed thing?" So shall you escape in that day, when the walls of Babylon shall be broken in pieces, though their foundations were deep as Hell, and broad as the sea or sky!

* Ogni monte, ogni lago, ogni luogo inaccessibile diventa piano, dove i forti difensori mancano.—*Macchiavelli.*

THE END.

LONDON:
Printed by A. SPOTTISWOODE,
New-Street-Square.

14 DAY USE
RETURN TO DESK FROM WHICH BORROWED

LOAN DEPT.

This book is due on the last date stamped below,
or on the date to which renewed. Renewals only:
Tel. No. 642-3405
Renewals may be made 4 days priod to date due.
Renewed books are subject to immediate recall.

Due end of SUMMER Period
subject to recall after — OCT 5'70 7

REC'D LD OCT 5'70 -10AM 6 2

LD21A–60*m*-8,'70
(N8837s10)476—A-32

General Library
University of California
Berkeley